

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 141 245

SO 010 129

AUTHOR Levy, Paul R., Ed.
TITLE Perspectives on Citizen Education.
INSTITUTION Institute for the Study of Civic Values,
Philadelphia, Pa.
SPONS AGENCY Hazen Foundation, New Haven, Conn.
FJB DATE 24 Jun 77
NOTE 107p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS American Government (Course); *Citizen Participation;
Citizen Role; *Citizenship; *Citizenship
Responsibility; Civics; Cultural Pluralism;
Democratic Values; *Educational Needs; Elementary
Secondary Education; Essays; Ethical Instruction;
Objectives; Politics; Skill Development; *Social
Studies; Values
IDENTIFIERS *Values Education

ABSTRACT

The essays on the topic of citizenship education were compiled for the founding retreat of the Alliance for Citizen Education held in Philadelphia on June 24-26, 1977. Written by both citizen educators and political theorists, the essays are polemical in tone and were intended to stimulate dialogue at the retreat. The readings are a mixture of theoretical essays, writings by practitioners, and examples of curriculum or strategies. The introduction discusses the purpose of the Alliance, the goals for citizen education, and why citizen education is urgently needed today. The essays that follow deal with the issues that confront citizen education and are organized around the themes of values, pluralism, participation, and empowerment. Titles include: A Cognitive-Developmental Approach to Moral Education; The Development of Effective Moral Decision-Making through Social Studies; On Teaching Democratic Ideals; Trans-National America; On Modernization in America; Democracy Is Not for Children; Teaching Political Participation Skills; Political Education for Minority Groups; and Grievance Handling for Effectiveness. (Author/RM)

* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

ED141245

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Paul Levy

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

PERSPECTIVES on CITIZEN EDUCATION

by Paul R. Levy

A collection of readings assembled
for the founding retreat of the

Alliance for Citizen Education

Sugar Loaf Conference Center
9230 Germantown Avenue
Philadelphia, Pa.

June 24-26, 1977

\$2.00

Prepared by
Institute for the Study of Civic Values
401 North Broad Street
Philadelphia, Pa. 19108

215-WA 2-8960

2

50 010 129

Perspectives on Citizen Education

Copyright (c) 1977, by the
Institute for the Study of Civic Values

Printed by the Philadelphia Resistance Print Shop
1116 Spring Garden Street Philadelphia, Pa. 19123
A unionized Printing Collective

PREFACE

This collection of writings was assembled for the founding retreat of the Alliance for Citizen Education in Philadelphia on June 24-26, 1977. The Introduction contains a statement as to the purpose of the Alliance, a discussion of the goals for Citizen Education, and a political and social analysis of why Citizen Education is so urgently needed today.

What follows is a series of essays, or excerpts from essays, that are organized around the themes of Values, Pluralism, Participation and Empowerment. It is hoped that these pieces might serve to generate interest and focus attention on the four central themes to be discussed at the conference:

What Values Should Citizen Education Promote?

How Should Citizen Education Respond to American Pluralism?

Should Citizen Education Promote Political Participation?

Alternative Strategies for Personal Empowerment.

By no means does this selection pretend to be an exhaustive compendium of the writings of citizen educators. Rather, it attempts to convey a bit of the diversity of opinion and approach within the field. Several of the essays, it will be noted, are not by "citizen educators" at all, but are by political theorists or activists who have addressed themselves to relevant issues. Some of the pieces are quite polemical in tone, which is precisely why they have been included. For it is the purpose of this selection to initiate a more complete and complex dialogue when we meet at our founding retreat.

Acknowledgements

The production of this document as well as the founding retreat of the Alliance for Citizen Education was made possible by a grant from the Edward Hazen Foundation of New Haven, Connecticut.

In addition, the editor wishes to acknowledge the assistance of the staff of the Institute and Sue Reinhard in particular, who typed this entire document.

contents

<u>Introduction</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. What is the Alliance for Citizen Education?	1.
Howard Mehlinger, "How Can We Improve Citizen Education for American Youth?"	1.
II. What are the Goals of Citizen Education?	4.
Richard Remy, "The Problem of Citizen Education Today."	5.
III. Why is There a Need for Citizen Education?	7.
Edward Schwartz, "Adult Political Education in the Anti-Political System."	7.
<u>The Issues That Confront Citizen Education</u>	
I. Values	16.
Lawrence Kohlberg, "A Cognitive-Developmental Approach to Moral Education."	17.
Nancy Bauer, "The Development of Effective Moral Decision-Making Through Social Studies."	22.
Paul Levy, "Ideals Worthy of Respect."	30.
John Schaar, "The Case for Patriotism."	34.
Edward Schwartz, "On Teaching Democratic Ideals."	46.
II. Pluralism	49.
Randolph Bourne, "Trans-National America."	49.
Norman Jacobson, "On Modernization in America."	53.
III. Participation	64.
Jean-Jacques Rousseau, "Deputies or Representatives."	65.
Donald Robinson, "Democracy is Not for Children."	67.
Judith Gillespie and Stuart Lazarus, "Teaching Political Participation Skills."	69.
IV. Empowerment	75.
Jesse Jackson, "Give the People a Vision."	75.
Christine B. Button, "Political Education for Minority Groups."	80.
Edward Schwartz, "Building Community."	85.
Trade Union Women's Studies, "Grievance Handling for Effectiveness."	94.

introduction

- I. What is the Alliance for Citizen Education? Page 1.
Howard Mehlinger,
"How Can We Improve Citizen Education
for American Youth?" Page 1.
- II. What are the Goals of Citizen Education? Page 4.
Richard Remy,
"The Problem of Citizen Education
Today." Page 5.
- III. Why is There a Need for Citizen Education?
Edward Schwartz,
"Adult Political Education in the
Anti-Political System." Page 7.

INTRODUCTION

I. What is the Alliance for Citizen Education?

The idea for an Alliance for Citizen Education emerged out of a series of informal discussions begun by individuals who had participated in a National Conference on "Education and Citizenship: Responsibilities for the Common Good" sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education in Kansas City in September, 1976. Many practitioners in the field--from schools, community organizations, churches, labor unions, and business--felt that there was a critical need for practitioners to keep in touch with one another. Presently, for example, social studies teachers have little contact with education directors of unions and citizen organizations, who are trying to promote active participation in the community. Similarly, practitioners of values education in the schools have not had much opportunity to explore their approaches with those in other institutions concerned with the breakdown of private and public morality. The Alliance, then, is conceived as a vehicle to promote dialogues on these and other issues facing citizen educators. It aims to create a national network among those who believe that such issues ought to be a central concern of all institutions.

Beyond initiating discussion between citizen educators, the Alliance may perform many other vital functions. In remarks delivered at the conference in Kansas City last fall, Howard Mehlinger envisioned what several of these activities might be.

"How Can We Improve Citizen Education for American Youth?"
Howard Mehlinger

...While the ultimate success of citizen education reforms depends upon what is achieved at the local level, an urgent need for national leadership exists also. At the present time, there is no national group charged with the responsibility to promote and cultivate citizen education in the United States. There are a great many groups and organizations that promote programs relevant to citizen education, but none has a constituency broad enough to assume overall responsibility. Certain learned societies, such as the American Political Science Association, encourage teaching and research in fields relevant to citizen education, but their membership bases are far too limited. This is also true of the various professional associations of educators. The National Council for

Howard Mehlinger is Director of the Social Studies Development Center in Indiana and President of the National Council for the Social Studies. The remarks reproduced here are drawn from the concluding part of his speech, "How Can We Improve Citizen Education for American Youth?"

for the Social Studies has long held citizen education to be its primary concern, but its membership, mainly high school social studies teachers and the college professors who prepare such teachers, is also too narrow. Groups such as the Joint Council for Economic Education, Global Perspectives, Incorporated, and the Alliance for Environmental Education appeal to somewhat broader constituencies, but they represent intellectual concerns that are segments of citizen education but do not encompass it. A number of university centers and independent projects make contributions to citizen education, but they have no constituency at all except for the particular clients for whom they work. Many voluntary, charitable, professional, and trade associations that do not count citizen education as a primary concern could contribute importantly but are not presently enlisted in the effort.

What appears to be needed is an alliance or a consortium of individuals, agencies, and groups who could join together explicitly for the purpose of promoting citizen education. Such an Alliance should bring together representatives from all sectors of American society: business, labor, government, education and other professions, churches, media, voluntary and charitable organizations, etc. Those who join will have multiple interests and concerns, but they will share a common desire to promote improvements in citizen education for American youth.

a.) It could monitor legislation and offer advice from a citizen education perspective. Legislation, for example, that has the effect of weakening the American family is probably bad for citizen education. It could make certain that citizen education is not excluded from authorizations and appropriations when it would be appropriate to be included. Recently, amendments to Title VI of the National Defense Education Act that authorizes support for university language and area study centers were added which permit funds for international education to be available for citizen education. Other Federal programs that provide general support for elementary and secondary education could be amended so that citizen education was not excluded from the authorizations or appropriations.

b.) It could publish newsletters, pamphlets, and books that draw attention to the needs of citizen education, identify resources available to promote citizen education, and disseminate information about promising programs in citizen education.

c.) It could establish a National Commission on Citizen Education. This Commission, consisting of leading scholars and public figures, should direct a study of the current state of citizen education in the United States and publish its findings.

d.) It could provide the energy for identifying and linking the intellectual resources needed to reform citizen education in the United States. These intellectual resources are scattered across various settings--universities, schools, foundations, government, voluntary associations, etc. No existing

organization brings these resources together for the purpose of sharing ideas, evaluating programs, and assessing experiments. A special weakness in citizen education is the absence of powerful conceptualizations that link the various contributors to citizen education and that respond to current social concerns. Such conceptualizations depend upon attracting intellectuals in to the citizen education arena.

e.) The alliance for citizen education could also promote national programs that would enhance the efforts of local communities. For example, no community by itself can expect to have much of an impact on network-sponsored children's television programs. But a national organization could monitor Saturday morning cartoon programs, for example, appraise the consequences of these programs for citizen education of children, and publicize its findings. It could encourage sponsors to withhold support from undesirable programs and encourage good ones. Syndicated comic strips contain citizen education messages. A national organization could meet with cartoonists, writers, and others who reach children and young adolescents through the comics and other mass media to discuss the kinds of impact their messages are having.

f.) A national organization might also stimulate needed research and development. We simply know less about some aspects of the citizen education process than we need to know. Moreover, some kinds of development activities have been ignored thus far. For example, in a nation that encourages free speech children are constantly assaulted with messages that are potentially quite harmful to their development. Parents worry about such influences but seem powerless to respond. Efforts to develop programs that help parents and schools prepare youth who are better able to cope with such influences might be useful.

Conclusion

The focus of this paper has been on how to improve citizen education of American youth. The implication is that the process of citizen education is occurring now and does not have to be established; it assumes that it is not a total failure but could stand improvement. The fact that our nation has survived 200 years of a noble experiment of self rule can be taken as partial evidence of success in citizen education. When we measure ourselves against our ideals, we are often disappointed. When we judge our accomplishments against those of other nations, we need not be embarrassed or discouraged.

It is important to keep this simple fact before us: There is no national law or heavenly edict that self government must survive in the United States. The founding fathers created it; each new generation must recommit themselves to its goals or it will perish. The defense of democracy is more than a willingness to bear arms against foreign invaders. Defending democracy means supporting its principles and accepting the responsibilities of citizenship.

There is no greater purpose in education than the cultivation of good citizenship. There is no greater heritage to leave to

(4.)

young people than the capacity to rule themselves in enlightened self interest.

II. What are the Goals of Citizen Education?

It is clear that citizen education as it is presently conceived entails something much broader than the high school civic lessons to which we all once were exposed, where the goal was to memorize the organizational charts of the local and federal government. The new breadth and complexity of citizen education is amply conveyed in the following statement of goals by Richard Remy.

"The Problem of Citizen Education Today"
Richard Remy

If citizenship education is to be revitalized, we will need something that we currently do not have. This is a reasonably thorough, detailed, and comprehensive definition of the *problem* that concerns us. While many definitions of and objectives for citizenship have recently been advanced, there has been little consideration given to the nature of the problem of citizenship education today. Yet an adequate definition of the problem should inform the commitment of intellectual, monetary, organizational, and material resources by policy-makers.

While our understanding is still growing, the experience of the Citizenship Development Program over the last four years has led us to posit six aspects of the problem of citizenship education that ought to be taken into account in educational planning and policy-making. First, citizenship is not just a segment of adult activity associated with governments. Rather, citizenship concerns rights and responsibilities associated with the governance of social groups such as families, churches, labor unions, schools, and private associations as well as cities, states, the nation-state, and the global system. As members of these groups, young people as well as adults are involved in problems and tasks associated with group governance. Teachers and students, for example, are citizens of their school as well as of their state and nation. *Hence, the problem of citizenship education is not simply a problem of preparing the young for a future adult role. Nor is it simply a problem of learning facts and loyalties relevant to governmental institutions.*

Second, the problem of citizenship education today is complicated by the fact that we are currently experiencing an intensified globalization of the human condition. In large measure citizenship education and "global, international, world-order, foreign affairs" education have been mutually isolated from one another. In the past, this state of affairs may have been both natural and tolerable. Today it is neither. If the expanding scope and scale of global interdependence is eradicating the boundaries that once separated foreign and domestic affairs, the same forces are eroding the boundaries that once separated education about American society from education about the rest of the world. *Hence, the problem of citizenship education includes the need to interrelate, integrate, and synthesize citizenship and global education.* Citizenship education without a coherent global perspective is not meeting today's need. Similarly, global education removed from the concrete concerns, problems, and issues confronting citizens in an increasingly interdependent world is not good global education.

Richard Remy is an Adjunct Associate Professor of Political Science at the Mershon Center, The Ohio State University. The above piece is excerpted from "Promoting Citizen Competence" which first appeared in the Quarterly Report of the Mershon Center in the Winter of 1977

Third, like the problem of health, the problem of citizenship education is a continuing challenge for each succeeding generation, not an "issue" to be somehow resolved once and for all. As conditions of increasing interdependence change, various facets of citizenship education will also change but the basic challenge will remain. *Hence, the problem of citizenship education cannot be "answered" or "resolved" in any one person's or institution's lifetime, nor should it be.*

Fourth, the problem of citizenship education is not confined to what happens in elementary and high schools. In actuality children, teachers, and adults in the community are interdependent elements in an ongoing educational process that constitutes a *learning community*. Community groups and institutions--for example, the League of Women Voters, the YMCA, churches, and businesses--are important arenas of civic activity that engage in the citizenship education of adults and children through their own instructional programs. *Hence, the problem of citizenship education is not simply an academic enterprise of interest to professional educators only, for schools and communities stand bound together in a symbiotic relationship.*

Fifth, key participants in the civic education process--the schools, the university, and the community--tend to be isolated from each other. Professors talk to and work with other professors; school personnel and lay leaders communicate with their own colleagues. This isolation is harmful to all concerned and is symptomatic of the larger problem of the relation of educational institutions to the rest of society. Unfortunately, while the phenomenon of isolation is well known to most educators, we have yet to find satisfactory ways to overcome it. *Hence, the problem of citizenship education includes the development of models to guide efforts to more effectively link education and society.*

Sixth, the processes we use to address the continuing problem of citizenship education are as important as "solutions" arrived at. These processes should be open, visible, and accessible. They should create independence rather than dependence in those involved. That is, they should help people learn how to cope more adequately with their own local agendas and problems. The alternative is problem-solving and decision by bureaucratic fiat or power/elite dominance. *Hence, the problem of citizenship education entails the creation of problem-solving processes that over a period of time will involve citizens in cycles of increasing awareness, evaluation, and self-conscious efforts to control their own destiny.*

III. Why is There a Need for Citizen Education?

Why have so many educators perceived a need for something they call citizen education? Are our citizens so poorly prepared for public life that they require remedial work in political participation and decision making? If this is the situation, how have we reached such a sorry state? Finally, does not the task of altering such a condition rest more appropriately upon the politicians and members of the media?

The following analysis by Edward Schwartz offers an interpretation of why we have found ourselves at such a critical impasse and suggests why the responsibility for a remedy must fall ultimately upon the educators.

"Adult Political Education in the Anti-Political System"

Edward Schwartz

...What are the political conditions that have given rise to adult political education? Even assuming that many American young people receive inadequate civic training in high school and college, couldn't they be expected to pick up enough knowledge on their own to handle the basic political choices they must make? Years ago, George Washington Plunkitt commented that a candidate had to unlearn a college education before he could be effective at winning votes in urban politics. What has happened to our political system that people now feel the need to return to classrooms before gaining enough confidence to participate?

These are questions that we must ask in order to place the rise of adult political education in proper perspective. It is only through an analysis of the political system that we can fully understand the goals of the new programs in adult citizen education, the similarities and differences among the various projects, and the disparity between these efforts and the civics and social studies courses offered in the schools. We need not examine every individual program to get a sense of what they do. They share a surprising range of assumptions, even when they deal with different ideologies and issues. A fraternity seems to be developing among the disgruntled and the disaffected among us, and it is leading to a revival of populist sentiments that cut across old ideological divisions. It is this populism, I would suggest, that has prompted a revival of adult political education, and given a common shape in its various forms.

Therefore, let me turn to my main thesis. It is one that will probably alarm some of you--although fewer now than ten years ago when leaders of the student Left first advanced it in the universities. I can state it in one line: the demand for political education has arisen as confidence in the anti-political system has declined. By the "anti-political system," I mean the network of large corporations that controls most of the wealth in the country, that employs a large percentage of our people, and that has emerged, in Peter Drucker's words, as the nation's "representative" institutions. I define this system as anti-political on several grounds; it disparages politics and tries to insulate itself against governmental control; it elevates individual achievement in the quest for wealth and power above the collective effort of communities to determine their common destinies; and it refuses to acknowledge that the historic ideals of civic equality, democratic participation, and substantive justice should even be standards for its behavior. Yet it is this anti-political system that decides most important matters for us--where we work, where we live, even how we live--and competes with political parties, voluntary organizations and government itself for our allegiance and support.

Edward Schwartz is President of the Institute for the Study of Civic Values in Philadelphia. The remarks above are excerpted from a speech delivered at Indiana University in April 1977 at a conference on "Issues in Citizen Education, Social Studies and Curriculum Theory". They represent a shorter version of the first chapter of his forthcoming book, Growing Up Powerless: the Case for Political Education.

Why, however, do I say that the breakdown of the anti-political system has given rise to the demand for political education, instead of attributing this demand to a breakdown in government? After all, even before the Kennedy administration and the upheavals that followed, E.E. Schattschneider labelled us a "semi-sovereign people." with the "largest elected oligarchy in the world," in which more than 40 million people--40% at the time--failed to show up at the polls on election day.¹ Pluralists like Seymour Martin Lipset, Daniel Bell, and Robert Dahl never disputed these statistics--how could they? They merely rationalized that as long as representatives, working through interest groups, could come to acceptable compromises through the "rules of the game," then the system was being responsive. Indeed, in Political Man, Professor Lipset even suggested that non-participation reflected broad satisfaction with the system, despite evidence that the non-voters tended to be poor, black and uneducated--with little reason to feel satisfied. Nonetheless, everyone agreed that our political institutions had failed to involve large sections of the populace; they merely disagreed as to whether the situation was cause for rejoice or alarm.

Yet if government was not the main source of authority in this pluralist universe, then it was the anti-political system that had to carry the burden. Both Weber and Durkheim had predicted that this would happen in modern society --that corporate, rationalized structures would mold the rest. Their words proved prophetic. As long as the Gross National Product grew, and the average citizen's standard of living rose over time--then the majority of the people were willing to put up with unresponsive government or at least not to resist it. Indeed, the economic goals of corporations became the standard by which people judged the success or failure of government. As John Kenneth Galbraith observed in 1967 in The New Industrial State:

Members of the technostructure, we have seen, identify themselves with its goals because they find these goals superior to their own and because there is a chance of adapting them to their own. The relationship of the technostructure of the mature corporation to the state is the same. The state is strongly concerned with the stability of the economy. And with its expansion or growth. And with education. And with technical and scientific advance. And, most notably, with the national defense. These are the national goals: they are sufficiently trite so that one has a reassuring sense of the obvious in articulating them. All have their counterpart in the needs and the goals of the technostructure. It requires stability in demands for its planning. Growth brings promotion and prestige. It requires trained manpower. It needs government underwriting of research and development. Military and other technical procurement support its most developed form of planning. At each point the government has goals with which the technostructure can identify itself. Or, plausibly, these goals reflect adaption of public goals to the goals of the technostructure.²

Even a Kennedy or a Johnson could not or would not be much better than this "technostructure" required; and the voters demonstrated on more than one

1.) E.E. Schattschneider, The Semi-Sovereign People, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960), p.90.

occasion that even when the price of "stimulating the economy" and "creating jobs" was a regressive tax system which put the entire burden of social programs and military expenditure upon them, they were willing to pay it.

Today, of course, most Americans do not share this faith in an abundant future, brought to us courtesy of General Motors and General Foods. We need not dwell on the events and movements that eroded it--the Civil Rights Movement, that challenged whether the wealth was "trickling down" to the bottom; the youth movement, that questioned whether it was offering genuine satisfaction and meaning to people at the top; the environmental movement, that imposed standards of ecology upon corporate use of the land; the consumer movement, that raised questions of health and safety about corporate behavior in the marketplace; and, importantly, the economy itself, that has produced declining real incomes for working people in every quarter since 1965. The important point is that the cumulative effect of all these movements has been to shatter the authority of the anti-political system decisively. Business leaders are now near the bottom of the public esteem scale, while consumer advocates are at the top. Now, even those who expected miracles from industry, technology, and cybernetics are turning to government for leadership and direction. For all the talk about the evils of the federal bureaucracy, it was Jimmy Carter's promise of "effective, competent government" that carried the day, not Gerald Ford's commitment to little government at all. Thus, the conclusion is inescapable: the demand for political education has grown in response to the breakdown of the anti-political system.

There is a second aspect to the problem, however. While citizens may want government to lead, they equally want it to listen. Indeed, the polls suggest that the public is angry at their politicians not for trying to do too much, but for kowtowing to a few "special interests" at the expense of the rest. The new demand for "power"--black and student power; ethnic and women power--reflects a desire to take part in the decisions that affect us, particularly since these decisions are shaping into greater and greater areas of our lives.

Yet where can the average citizen acquire the requisite training to be able to influence government effectively? Certainly not in schools designed to meet the requirements of the anti-political system--that is, to produce skilled, but obedient, technicians and bureaucrats. Recent studies suggest that the school is not even a good place to acquire knowledge about politics. The New York Times recently reported on a study of 13 to 17 year olds undertaken by the National Assessment of Educational Programs that revealed that more than half of the 17 year olds could not correctly answer a question that required an understanding of the Fifth Amendment's protection against self-incrimination, and that one out of every eight students believed that the President is not required to obey the law.³

In the area of cultivating political skills, the record of the schools is even more bleak. Nowhere is the impact of the anti-political system more apparent. Where political education would cultivate the ability of people to reach common decisions through debate and dialectic, the schools

emphasize a corporate standard of "rationality" that almost precludes serious conflict between differing points of view. Where democratic processes would promote discussion and argument as the best way to arrive at a common standard of justice, the schools--like the corporations--promote silence in the name of efficiency. Equality would be the ethic of any decent program of political education; hierarchy is what the schools offer to prepare students for the major bureaucracies. The ability to mobilize, to organize, to confront unresponsive institutions would be the mark of a good student of politics, but since such a mark would be a black mark on the employment line, the schools scrupulously avoid trying to make it.

So now citizens face a double dilemma--they expected the corporate system to offer the major rewards of our society--jobs, income, security--only to discover that government action is needed to bring equity to the process. They attended school to learn how to adjust to the anti-political system, --to get a job, to become a consumer--only to learn later that they also need political skills to influence the major decisions that affect them. It is this situation which generates the need for political education for adults. At this point, citizens must try to acquire political skills and aptitudes that they never thought they would need, because they were always told that they wouldn't.

If the breakdown of the anti-political system has put individual citizens in an impossible position, it has been no less a problem for major interest groups. Lobbies like the AFL-CIO and the NAACP might have remained credible had the economy itself continued to respond to the basic needs of their members. Yet a strategy that called for seeking incremental improvements through collective bargaining, court decisions, and social welfare programs could not survive in a world where major movements were demanding a fundamental restructuring of American institutions, while, alternatively, multinational corporations were consolidating their power over our basic resources. We are all familiar with what happened when minorities and students gave up on working "within the system." Today, the parallel response of the middle class to unemployment, inflation, and continuing economic crisis has been even worse--sullen withdrawal from political life. Apathy, selfishness, and powerlessness have replaced riots, rebellions, and violent revolutionaries as the three most serious diseases afflicting the American polity today, and virtually every major institution is struggling for a way to remedy them.

Complaints about apathy are the most widespread among citizen organizations. Every group--whether it be a church social organization; or a neighborhood association; or a union local; or a political action movement--bitches about apathy. How can they build loyalty among the mass of their members? How can they find people to do the work of the organization? Even when leaders know well how unhappy their friends and neighbors are about the state of the nation, they will still blame most of their problems on apathy. Indeed, I would suggest that it is really another version of "blaming the victim," whereby citizens flagellate themselves for situations that the anti-political system has created. Can we condemn people who grew up learning that the economic order would meet their needs--all they had to do was get a job--for not knowing how to respond to the betrayal of this promise? Yet to the leaders of most of the country's interest groups, it is nothing more than apathy that stands in the way of a massive citizen revolt.

Selfishness--greed--is a second anti-political value that gets in the way of political commitment. In the public forums that the Institute for the Study of Civic Values has sponsored in Philadelphia over the past three years, there has hardly been a meeting in which somebody doesn't denounce the competitiveness of the country, the "every man for himself" atmosphere of all institutions, the scramble for the "Almighty dollar." Workers complain now not only about their managers, but about their co-workers. Neighborhood residents are fed up not only with city hall, but with the people on their blocks who won't keep their kids off the streets late at night. Politically active citizens have had it with the "wheeling and dealing" associated with conventional politics, to the point that all issues now quickly escalate to a level of high moral crisis, if not discourse. Every poll in the past three years attested to the deep longing of the public for a renewed respect for common civic and moral values; and, of course, President Carter built his campaign almost entirely around this theme. Yet, needless to say, the problem hasn't vanished with the Carter Presidency.

The third, and perhaps most pervasive complaint, is that of powerlessness. In 1963, it was only radical students at Port Huron who were prepared to talk about gaining "power over the decisions that affect our lives." Then it became black people, and other minorities, and women. Now it is everyone--young workers, ethnics, urban neighborhood activists, taxpayers, farmers,--everyone feels a loss of power. To be sure, some will say that if people just weren't so apathetic and selfish, then they could all get together and regain the power that corporations have taken from them, but this is not the only position. A substantial majority--as high as 60%--will now respond affirmatively on political alienation questionnaires to the proposition that "People like me don't have much say at all about what the government does."

It is the effort to combat these privatized responses to the anti-political system--apathy, selfishness, and powerlessness--that pushes citizen groups and activists to develop new programs in adult citizen education. They understand that conveying knowledge about the issues is necessary to the process, but insufficient. They are aware that even reviewing how the political system operates would not matter, as long as their members felt that they could do little to change it. Fundamentally, the new adult programs are aiming at changing political behavior--changing observers into members, changing mere members into active participants. All the programs share this goal of expanding participation. They differ only as to which of the three anti-political values that they most try to combat. To the unions, apathy is the major enemy; to churches, it is selfishness; to a growing network of centers for training community organizers, it is powerlessness. Yet even a cursory glance at these varied undertakings suggest that building involvement is the theme of all of them.

In the unions' case, week-long, intensive training sessions or institutes are the vehicle for training. Most major labor organizations sponsor such programs every summer, generally at state universities like Rutgers, Penn State, or Cornell with departments in worker education. They vary little from union to union. Participants receive intensive instruction in the union contract, in grievance procedures, and in principles of collective bargaining. They also learn the union's stands on the major political issues and hear arguments from prominent union officials in support of them. Usually, politicians sympathetic to the union make appearances. Thus, by the end of the week, those

in attendance--who include business agents, shop stewards, and promising newcomers--can return to their factories imbued with a sense of the organization's mission and armed with a set of arguments and tactics to transmit this feeling to the other members.

And herein lies the not-so-hidden agenda of the summer institutes. It is a powerful device for reinforcing commitment to the union from the participants, and for showing them how to combat the apathy of the members. Labor organizations may be compulsory in most states, but active involvement in them is not. Yet participation is essential to a union if it is to succeed in collective bargaining and in its political objectives. To encourage this sort of commitment, the organizations will make sure that its officers are fully knowledgeable about the union's benefits; that they can relate to the members in terms that they can understand; and they understand the connection between "solidarity forever" and better hours and working conditions from the company. The United Auto Workers has the most elaborate program to accomplish all of this, including a two-week retreat at a beautiful conference center in Black Lake, Michigan, where all participants go through a mock union convention. Not surprisingly, the U.A.W. has remained a strong union during the harshest periods for the automobile industry. They simply won't accept apathy as an immutable law of human nature.

To the churches, the major problems have been selfishness and greed. In the past five years, since the burial of the anti-war movement, there has been real soul-searching on the part of all denominations on how to relate their religious mission to the social and political concerns of the people. For the Catholic Church, the response has been to turn to the ethnic neighborhoods where their parishes are located--to support community education and organizing that will preserve the neighborhoods' vitality and power. It is safe to say that the Church, through its Campaign for Human Development and the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs, is the main source of organizing money in the United States today.

Yet a parallel debate is taking place within Protestant denominations as well. Edward Powers of the United Church of Christ, for example, produced something called The Shalom Curriculum a few years ago, designed as a moral and civic education program for its congregants. The National Council of Churches, in turn, cooperated with the People's Bicentennial Commission last year in producing something called, The Light and the Steeple--more or less a study guide for discussion groups on America's revolutionary heritage and values. Within the Jewish community, finally, there is a renewed discussion of the synagogue's relationship to the surrounding Jewish community, beyond its current involvement in Israel and the plight of Soviet Jews. What is important here is not merely that churches and synagogues are trying to respond to the problems of individualism and acquisitiveness in modern life--that is what they are supposed to do. The interesting point for our purposes is that they have chosen to initiate a range of formal programs, even courses, in moral and citizen education for adults as a vehicle to bring these concerns from the pulpit back into the communities where people are raising them.

Finally, in the area of combatting powerlessness, we come to the most dramatic new development in the area of adult citizen education--the growth of several training centers for community organizing. Saul Alinsky's Industrial Area Foundation in Chicago stood almost alone in this field for 20

years. Today, the I.A.F. has stiff competition. In Chicago itself, a group called the National Training Center runs week-long crash courses in how to gain power in local neighborhoods, at the same time as it supports a national network of groups called National People's Action that has led important fights against redlining by banks and for federal community development programs responsive to neighborhoods. Also in Chicago is Heather Booth's Midwest Academy, with ties to the labor and political movements, as well as connections with community organizations that see themselves as pursuing the values of the movements of the 1960's. The Martin Luther King Center in Atlanta has emerged as a major source for training in non-violence and citizen action for the entire South; while the New England Training Center is serving a similar role in New England. These are just a few examples, but they are extremely important. The movement of neighborhoods has been activated only in the past four years, but it is certain to grow. One critical reason is the number of training centers whose whole purpose is to provide organizers to make them grow.

Thus, through unions, churches, and community organizing centers, a growing number of citizens are learning how to combat the ills of apathy, greed, and powerlessness that have arisen in the anti-political system. You will notice that I have said nothing at all about the role of formal educational institutions--universities, colleges, and high schools-- in the process. That is because at this time they are playing no role in it. All the innovation is taking place outside of the institutions whose purpose is education. There may be justification for this somewhere but I doubt it. Ideally, an educational institution ought to be a center for all kinds of learning in a community, and especially for the kind of education that we have been discussing. Citizen education is not some recent invention of the radical left. It has deep roots in the Athens of 4th Century, B.C. and in Jefferson's vision of an educated populace in this country. If modern colleges and universities no longer take these concerns seriously, it is they who are betraying tradition, not the activists.

Yet there is little question that to offer substantive assistance to the new programs in adult political education that are developing, higher education and secondary education would have to redefine the kind of knowledge that it now takes seriously. It would have to recognize that its current emphasis on "value-free" scholarship, on "rational" techniques, on hierarchy, and on neutrality may reflect the imperatives of a modern, anti-political system, but not an educational theology emblazoned in bronze for all time. There have been other equally valid notions of what a university might consider to be knowledge, all thoroughly consistent with political education. I have alluded to some of these in passing, but it would be useful to pinpoint them more directly here.

First, to become responsive to political education, higher education--and high schools--would have to respect the process of learning about values. To be sure, academia promotes certain values now--"objectivity," tolerance, due process, merit. Yet it projects itself as value-free. To assist civic education, these institutions would themselves have to adhere to the covenants of America's civil religion. They would not be ashamed or embarrassed to promote commitment to the principles of the Declaration of Independence and the Preamble to the Constitution, even while encouraging the widest possible debate

on how they might be applied. As every activist discovers, there can be no common action without shared values. Thus, the university would have to admit that it shares certain values with the country as well and that one of its goals is to help students come to grips with them.

Second, the university would have to learn how to relate the issues of modern society--employment, energy, corporate power, peace--to the broad values that it was examining. Under the anti-political system, every consideration is removed from private and public decision making but the narrowest questions of profit and loss. Issues of equity, ecology, reciprocity, even honesty and morality are reduced to "impact statements" to be designed by a planner and tested through a computer. Whatever the requirements modern citizenship might create, learning how to become a computer programmer should not be among them. Indeed, it should be the educator's responsibility to help people relate their concerns to their commitments, not the citizen's job to figure out what abstruse statistical data means in every case. Figuring out the appropriate techniques for these analyses, then, should be an important responsibility of any institution that wanted to take adult political education seriously.

Ultimately, however, the university that wanted to provide the kind of political education that adults need most would have to take the goal of civic participation seriously in itself. They could not be content to impart a few political facts and think that they were educating for politics, or even leaving open the "option" of participation to those who wanted to take advantage of it. Theirs would have to be the ethic of Pericles--"we do not say that a man who takes no interest in politics is a man who minds his own business; we say that he has no business here at all." Indeed, the major criticism of the anti-political system on the part of activists is that it does not take this standard seriously. For the university to be of service, then, it would have to rethink its position on participation, and reestablish its connection to our democratic heritage, rather than to the corporate ideologies that have undermined it.

Thus, we can summarize the state of adult citizen education as follows --it has arisen in response to the breakdown of the anti-political system, at a time when people lack both the political knowledge and skill to make government work again. Where anti-politics promoted individualism, privatism, hierarchy, and obedience, it aims at promoting cooperation, equality, and participation. The skills it aims at cultivating are those that will help people combat apathy, selfishness, and powerlessness in relationships to government and other major institutions in society. The institutions that support are those that themselves feel some moral stake within society--unions, churches, community organizations and centers. The formal educational institutions largely have ignored it--or, at best, given it secondary support. Yet the movement has continued to grow. To be sure, this is not the first time that the demand for political education has arisen in response to the corruption of a regime. Plato called for it as a way of building Athens in the 4th Century B.C.; St. Augustine saw it as the salvation of Rome; Rousseau prescribed it for 18th Century France. Yet these teachers were not really heard by the people of their times--at least not by enough to make a difference--and the empires that they condemned suffered the fate that they predicted for them.

The irony today, however, is that it is the people who are demanding political education, in much the same spirit as Plato, St. Augustine, and Rousseau. We will have to wait and see whether their teachers will catch up with them.

The Issues that Confront Citizen Educators

The remainder of this reader is devoted to the four broad themes that are of central concern to proponents of citizen education:

What Values Should Citizen Education Promote?

How Should Citizen Education Respond to American Pluralism?

Should Citizen Education Promote Political Participation?

Alternative Strategies for Personal Empowerment.

Each of the four sections begins with a short editorial comment that summarizes the issues that are addressed by the readings. Then several essays, or excerpts, representing diverse viewpoints are offered, with only brief introductory remarks to identify the author and orient the reader.

Two principles of selection were applied: first, the readings had to articulate differing points of view and do justice to the variety of opinion: second, the selections had to be of literary value and of intrinsic interest. For just as a bored population will rarely participate, an uninspired educator rarely will teach.

values

- Lawrence Kohlberg,
"A Cognitive-Developmental Approach
to Moral Education." Page 17.
- Nancy Bauer,
"The Development of Effective Moral
Decision-Making Through Social Studies." Page 22.
- Paul Levy,
"Ideals Worthy of Respect." Page 30.
- John Schaar,
"The Case for Participation." Page 34.
- Edward Schwartz,
"On Teaching Democratic Ideals." Page 46.

VALUES

In the past decade there has been a renewed interest in the teaching of values. Some have been motivated by the glaring absence of moral standards among our political leaders. Others are concerned with what they perceive as a more pervasive breakdown in social morality. Many sense that the traditional vehicles for moral education--religious institutions, the family, the local community--are no longer effectively performing this vital function. As a result, a variety of educators have come to view the teaching of values as a central task of the schools.

Yet what values are we to teach? Do we follow the example of the proponents of "values clarification" and attempt merely to make students aware that they have values, that these values have consequences, and then seek a mutual tolerance of differences? As Nancy Bauer asks in one of the following pieces, does this carry us much beyond the stage where we might say: "Before, I sensed that there was something I didn't like about you, but I couldn't put my finger on it. Since values clarification, I know why I can't stand you."

The work of Lawrence Kohlberg suggests one apparently constructive alternative. His essay "A Cognitive-Developmental Approach to Moral Education." is reproduced below. Kohlberg argues that there are indeed cross-cultural ethical standards which will gradually emerge through a process of Socratic dialogue. Further, he maintains that there are universal stages of moral development: the highest one being the Kantian imperative to treat each individual as an end unto himself. He thereby argues against a relativistic approach to values by insisting that there are higher standards of justice at which all truly moral individuals will eventually arrive.

But is the attainment of Kohlberg's "stage six," the universal standard of justice to be achieved by a few, exemplary individuals, an adequate goal for citizen educators? Wouldn't this ideal of the solitary, moral individual be potentially compatible with a political regime that restricts participation and equality for all? It ought to be noted, for example, that Kant, whom Kohlberg himself cites, found his conception of moral behavior consistent with the absolutist, anti-democratic Prussian state of the 18th century. (1.) Indeed, there is a tradition in German thinking, dating back to Luther that finds inner spiritual freedom and morality consistent with life in a prison cell. (2.)

1.) Leonard Krieger, The German Idea of Freedom, (Chicago: The University Press, 1957.,) pp 86-124.

2.) Martin Luther, "Comments of the 'Twelve Articles of the Peasants'"

A far different conception of the values that educators ought to teach places its emphasis not on individual, but on civic ideals. Three pieces by Paul Levy, John Schaar and Edward Schwartz develop this alternative tradition.

Overall, the essays in this section address the issue of what values ought to be taught, rather than the question of how to teach the values we hold. To be sure, as Nancy Bauer suggests, this approach is not by itself sufficient. For frequently, when our educational values are translated into programs, "the sense of direction is lost and the assumptions are dropped." But for reasons of space, this section is limited to a discussion of content of the values we seek to promote.

The first piece, "A Cognitive-Development Approach to Moral Education" by Lawrence Kohlberg is reproduced from The Humanist, November/December, 1972.

A Cognitive-Developmental Approach to Moral Education

by Lawrence Kohlberg

This article draws on material presented by the author in the International Encyclopedia of Education, 1972, and by Sara L. Kohlberg in "Means and Ends in Moral Education," (Harvard Graduate School of Education Bulletin, XV:3, Fall, 1971). It is elaborated in a forthcoming book on the developmental approach to moral education.

Moral philosophy and moral psychology represent the two basic areas of inquiry into moral education. Moral psychology studies what moral development *is*. Moral philosophy considers what moral development *ought to be*. Because the two types of inquiry—the "is" of psychology and the "ought" of philosophy—must be integrated before one can have a reasoned

basis for moral education, I shall try to speak from both points of view throughout this article.

Central to moral education is the problem of relativity of values: Are there universal values that children should develop? Our solution to this problem rests on recent findings of psychological research that show culturally universal stages of moral development. These findings help generate a philosophy of moral education as the stimulation of moral development, rather than the direct teaching of fixed moral rules. We present, then, a theory of moral education that is both psychological and philosophical.

Overview of Theories

The theory of moral psychology we shall use in presenting the facts is basically that of John Dewey, more recently elaborated by Jean Piaget¹ and myself.² The moral philosophy of education is also basically that of Dewey³ as we have elaborated it in terms of contemporary philosophic thought.⁴

Although the ideas presented in this article are largely warmed-over Dewey, they are very different from those popularized as progressive education in the 1930's and 1940's. The progressive-educational psychologists and philosophers of the 1930's elaborated Dewey's expression of the goals of education in terms of the child's social traits and values, but often

"The principle central to the development of moral judgment . . . is that of justice."

neglected certain of his key assumptions. These were (1) that intelligent thought about the education of social traits and values required a philosophic concept of morality and moral development, which is a very different concept from "social adjustment" or "mental health"; (2) that moral development passed through invariant qualitative stages; and (3) that the stimulation of moral development, like other forms of development, rested on the stimulation of thinking and problem-solving by the child.

These are the core assumptions of the "cognitive-developmental" or "progressive" theory of moral education presented in this article. Before presenting our theory and explaining how it may be employed in practice, we shall briefly consider and criticize two other theories of moral education, since they are better known and more widely accepted by educators. The first is the "common-sense" theory behind traditional moral education. According to this theory, "everyone knows what's right and wrong," or at least most law-abiding adults do. Adults, then, know a set of facts about morality of which children are ignorant, facts like "stealing is always wrong" or "helping others is good." These facts may be taught on the basis of the teacher's superior knowledge and authority, just as the facts of arithmetic are taught. Not only are children ignorant of moral facts; they are weak and easily tempted to lie, cheat, fight, disobey, and so forth. Children, then, need not only to be taught moral facts; they need to be taught to practice moral behavior and habits, and to be appropriately rewarded for moral behavior and punished for yielding to temptation.

In opposition to this traditional view, another has developed: the relativistic-emotional approach, which is popularly considered the view of child psychology and child psychiatry and is perhaps the most thoroughly elaborated by psychoanalysis. In his social and moral personality, the child is seen as primarily a creature of emotions and needs. Morality, in turn, is no absolute which the child must be

measured against, but represents the relativistic rules and standards of the child's culture. The child eventually must adjust to these rules in a realistic manner as part of his mental health, and will do so if his home and school environment are meeting his inner needs in a fairly adequate manner.

The cognitive-developmental or progressive view starts philosophically from a different view of morality than either common sense or personality psychology. It claims that, at heart, morality represents a set of *rational principles of judgment and decision* valid for every culture, the principles of human welfare and justice. The lists of rules and commandments drawn up by cultures and schools are more or less arbitrary, and hence their teaching tends to rely upon authority rather than reason. Moral principles, however, represent a rational organization of the child's own moral experience. We customarily attempt to deal with other adults as reasonable creatures in moral matters, and we need also to see that the child can be a reasonable being, that he thinks for himself and considers fairness and the welfare of himself and others. We tend not to draw fully upon the reasonable side of the child in moral matters because, although the child does reason, he reasons in a different way than the adult. His way of thinking about fairness or human welfare is not the adult's; it represents a *different stage* of moral reason.

Our research into the stages in the development of moral reasoning, then, provides the key to a new approach to moral education as the stimulation of children's moral judgment to the next stage of development, and as the stimulation of the child's ability to act consistently in accordance with his own moral judgment. This approach generates a new "Socratic" way for the teacher to conduct discussions about values in the areas of social studies, humanities, religious education, and sex education. It also gives the democratic school a way to foster moral development through increasing the child's participation and responsibility in a community he perceives as *just*.

The Principle of Justice

Filling the moral vacuum with a positive and coherent scheme of values requires attention by educators to both means and ends. With regard to ends, both psychology and philosophy support the claim that there are, in fact, universal human ethical values and principles. A key word here is "principles," for a moral principle is not the same as a rule. "Thou shalt not commit adultery" is a rule for specific behavior in specific situations, in a monogamous society. By contrast, the categorical imperative (act only as you would

be willing that everyone should act in the same situation) is a principle—not a prescription for behavior, but a guide for choosing among behaviors. As such it is free from culturally defined content; it both transcends and subsumes particular social laws and hence has universal applicability.

The principle central to the development of moral judgment, and hence to our proposals for moral education, is that of *justice*. Justice, the primary regard for the value and equality of all human beings, and for reciprocity in human relations, is a basic and universal standard. Using justice as the organizing principle for moral education meets all the criteria which any such plan must satisfy: It guarantees freedom of belief, it employs a philosophically justifiable concept of morality, and it is based on the psychological facts of human development.

As social psychologists, my colleagues and I have gathered considerable evidence to indicate that the concepts of justice inhere in human experience, instead of being the product of a particular world-view. In this we follow Piaget, who says, "In contrast to a given rule imposed upon the child from outside, the rule of justice is an immanent condition of social relationships or a law governing their equilibrium." All social life necessarily entails assuming a variety of roles, taking other people's perspectives, and participating in reciprocal relationships, so that arriving at the principle of human equality is simply an effect of maturity in interpersonal relations. It is a normal (if not frequent) result of social existence, rather than a quirk of personality or an act of faith.

Stages of Moral Judgment

Individuals acquire and refine the sense of justice through a sequence of *invariant* developmental stages. In 1957, we began testing the moral judgment of a group of 72 boys aged 10 through 16 by asking them questions involving moral dilemmas. A typical question raises the issue of stealing a drug to save a dying woman. The inventor of the drug is selling it for 10 times what it costs him to make. The woman's husband cannot raise the money, and the seller refuses to lower the price or wait for payment. What should the husband do? From the answers given by the group we distinguished six basic types of moral judgment which, we find, correspond to developmental stages. Subsequent re-testing of the group at three-year intervals has shown growth proceeding through the same stages in the same order.

The stages are:

1. Orientation to punishment and reward, and to physical and material power.

2. Hedonistic orientation with an instrumental view of human relations. Beginning notions of reciprocity, but with emphasis on exchange of favors—"You scratch my back and I'll scratch yours."

3. "Good boy" orientation; seeking to maintain expectations and win approval of one's immediate group; morality defined by individual ties of relationship.

4. Orientation to authority, law, and duty, to maintaining a fixed order, whether social or religious, which is assumed as a primary value.

5. Social-contract orientation, with emphasis on equality and mutual obligation within a democratically established order; for example, the morality of the American Constitution.

6. Morality of individual principles of conscience that have logical comprehensiveness and universality. Highest value placed on human life, equality, and dignity.

"Moral judgment is primarily a function of rational operations. Affectional factors . . . enter in, but moral situations are defined . . . by the judging individual."

The stages are not defined by particular opinions or judgments, but by ways of thinking about moral matters and bases for choice. Stages 1 and 2, which are typical of young children and delinquents, are described as "pre-moral," since decisions are made largely on the basis of self-interest and material considerations. The group-oriented Stages 3 and 4 are the "conventional" ones at which most of the adult population operates. The final "principled" stages are characteristic of 20 to 25 per cent of the adult population, with perhaps 5 to 10 per cent arriving at Stage 6.

Each stage is itself defined by values or issues that enter into moral decisions. One such issue is the value placed on life. At Stage 1, life is valued in terms of the power or possessions of the person involved; at Stage 2, for its usefulness in satisfying the needs of the individual in question or others; at Stage 3, in terms of the individual's relations with others and their valuation of him; at Stage 4, in terms of social or religious law. Only at Stage 6 is each life seen as inherently worthwhile, aside from all other considerations.

For example: Tommy, age 10, was asked, "Is it better to save the life of one important person or a lot of unimportant people?" He replied, "All the people that aren't important, because one man just has one house and maybe a lot of furniture, but a whole bunch of people have an awful lot of furniture and some of these poor people might have a lot of money and it

doesn't look it." Tommy's thinking here is defined as Stage 1, not because there is a right or wrong answer, but because of the immaturity of his confusion between the value of life and the value of property.

Another factor defining the stage of judgment is motivation for moral action. At the lowest stages, the individual acts to avoid punishment or to obtain exchange of favors; at the highest level, to avoid self-condemnation. Stage-2 thinking in this area is apparent in Jimmy, age 13, who was asked whether a boy should tell his father about a brother's misdeed: "I think he should keep quiet. He might want to go someplace like that, and if he squeals on Alex, Alex might squeal on him." A Stage-3 answer to this question might be that the boy should tell because his father trusts him—or else that he should not because Alex trusts him.

Most people are quite consistent in their use of a single type of thinking. About 50 per cent of an individual's moral statements correspond to a dominant stage and the rest fall generally into the stages immediately above and below. Stage of thinking usually holds constant regardless of the content of the dilemma presented—a delinquent at a pre-moral stage will regard all norms in the same way, whether they are the norms of society or of his gang, conforming in either case only to avoid punishment.

The same stages of development are also found in other cultures, although average progress is faster and farther in some than in others. We have tested youngsters in the US, Great Britain, Mexico, Turkey, Taiwan, and Malaysia, and distinguished the same patterns of thought occurring in the same developmental sequence. When Taiwanese village boys, for example, were asked whether a man should steal food for his starving wife, a typical answer from a preadolescent was, "Yes, because otherwise he will have to pay for her funeral and that costs a lot." A Malaysian child of the same age was likely to say, "Yes, because he needs her to cook his food." Funerals are less important in Malaysia than in Taiwan, so the cultural content of the reply changes, but the Stage-2 orientation of young children remains constant.

Conditions for Moral Development

What spurs progress from one stage to another, and why do some individuals reach the principled stages while others do not? Our answer, the cognitive-developmental one, builds on the work of Piaget, although it differs from Piaget on a number of important issues. Moral judgment is primarily a function of rational operations. Affectional factors such as the ability to empathize and the capacity for

guilt necessarily enter in, but moral situations are defined cognitively by the judging individual. Moral development is therefore a result of an increasing ability to perceive social reality or to organize and integrate social experience. One necessary—but not sufficient—condition for principled morality is the ability to reason logically (represented by stages of formal operations).

"The teacher must help the child to consider genuine moral conflicts, think about the reasoning he uses in solving such conflicts, see inconsistencies and inadequacies in his way of thinking, and find ways of resolving them."

The main experiential determinants of moral development seem to be amount and variety of social experience, the opportunity to take a number of roles and to encounter other perspectives. Thus middle-class and popular children progress farther and faster than do lower-class children and social isolates. Similarly, development is slower in the semiliterate village cultures that have been studied. Being able, through wide practice, to take another's viewpoint, to "put yourself in his place" is the source of the principled sense of equality and reciprocity. Perhaps the best summary of the situation in everyday language comes from E.M. Forster, who thought that most of the trouble in the world is due to "the inability to imagine the innerness of other lives."

An example of the power of such experiences comes from an experiment by Dowell, who helped high school students counsel one another in the "client-centered" or "nondirective" manner. The experience led to a significant upward-stage movement in moral reasoning, presumably stimulated by the experience of intense effort to take the view of the other. In contrast, pilot work suggests that being counseled or being a member of a self-answer group does not generate moral movement because it does not entail new experiencing of the perspectives of others.

The opportunity for moral role-taking appears to be what is most important in the contribution of the family to moral development. A study by Holstein³ indicated that children who were advanced in moral judgment had parents who were also advanced in moral judgment. Quite separately, however, the parents' tendency to stimulate reciprocal role-taking was also related to the child's maturity. The parent who sought the child's view, who elicited comparison of views in dialogue, had more advanced children.

Popular views of moral development assume that it is the product first of the home, and second of religion. Our studies

indicate that, although the home is important, its positive effects upon development are primarily due to the provision of role-taking opportunities also provided by the peer group, the school, and the wider society. The power of the peer group and the school to stimulate moral development in the absence of family influences is indicated by a study conducted in Israel.⁴ The study suggested that placement of disadvantaged adolescents in the kibbutz caused rapid moral development during a period when they had little direct contact with their own parents.

Religion and religious education also do not appear to play any unique role in moral development. The kibbutz mentioned was atheistic. In general, our studies indicate that variations in religious affiliation and attendance are unrelated to moral development.

Planned Moral Education in the Public Schools

It appears that total educational environments like the kibbutz can influence moral development. A series of studies by Blatt and Kohlberg⁷ indicate that more restricted educational efforts to stimulate moral development can also have a significant effect on children. Sixth- and 10th-graders in groups of 10 met twice a week for three months to discuss moral dilemmas. A majority of the students in the classes moved ahead almost one full stage, a substantial change for that period of time. Furthermore, those who had advanced after the 12 weeks remained advanced one year later as compared to a control group without the moral-discussion experience. The Blatt studies suggest that by using procedures little different from those available to any teacher, it is possible to raise children's moral level significantly and in a way that is sustained over time.

While the moral discussion procedures used by Blatt are available to teachers, they are quite different from those that teachers ordinarily use. The procedures rely upon both the induction of cognitive conflict about moral issues and exposure to the stage of thinking next above the student's own.

In the first procedure, the moral-education curriculum focuses upon a series of moral dilemmas which the instructor and the students discuss. The dilemmas are selected because they generate cognitive conflict—uncertainty about what is right, about the adequacy of the current moral beliefs the student holds—or because they generate disagreement between students.

The second procedure elicits discussion between students at two adjacent stages. Most classrooms, like those used by Blatt, will naturally be composed of students in at least three different and adjacent stages. Since the children were not all functioning

at the same stage, the arguments they used with each other were at different levels. In the course of these discussions among the students, the teacher first supported and clarified those arguments that were one stage above the lowest stage among the children—for example, the teacher supported Stage 3 rather than Stage 2. When it seemed that these arguments were understood by the students, the teacher then challenged that stage, using new situations, and clarified the arguments one stage above the previous one—Stage 4 rather than Stage 3. As noted earlier, at the end of the semester, all the students were retested; they showed significant upward change as compared to the controls, and maintained the change one year later.

The educational implications of these experiments are that the teacher must help the child to consider genuine moral conflicts, think about the reasoning he uses in solving such conflicts, see inconsistencies and inadequacies in his way of thinking, and find ways of resolving them. To do this, the teacher must know the child's level of thought, match his level by communicating at the level directly above, focusing on reasoning, and help the child experience the type of conflict that leads to an awareness of the greater adequacy of the next stage.

This classroom-discussion program is only one example of how the cognitive-developmental approach can be applied in the school. The classroom discussion approach should be part of a broader, more enduring involvement of students in the social and moral functioning of the school. Rather than attempting to inculcate a predetermined and unquestioned set of values, teachers should challenge students with the moral issues faced by the school community as problems to be solved, not merely situations in which rules are mechanically applied.

At present, the schools themselves are not especially moral institutions. Institutional relationships tend to be based more on authority than on ideas of justice. Adults are often less interested in discovering how children are thinking than in telling them what to think. The school atmosphere is generally a blend of Stage 1, punishment morality, and Stage 4, "law and order," which fails to impress—or stimulate—children involved in their own Stage-2 or Stage-3 moral philosophies. Children and adults stop communicating with one another, horizons are narrowed, and development is stunted.

At present our experimenting with creation of a just community to stimulate moral development is going on in a prison, not a school. Led by Joseph Hickey,⁸ a team from Harvard has instituted a self-governing justice community among 25 women and five custodial staff living together in a unit of a larger prison. At their meetings the 30 members of the com-

munity have drawn up and are maintaining a constitution. These are combined with small-group discussions about moral and personal dilemmas. The experiment has been successful in demonstrating the viability of self-government and self-discipline through a community-justice process, and in raising the stage of moral judgment of the inmates. Its effect on their long-range life patterns remains to be determined.

Although our experiment is not the first demonstration that democracy can work in prisons or in schools, it is the first to demonstrate directly that democracy not only works, but that it also stimulates moral development. In that sense it is the first experimental demonstration of what John Dewey said in 1909: If schools wish to foster morality, they will have to provide an atmosphere in which interpersonal issues are settled on the basis of principle rather than power. They will have to take moral questions seriously, and provide food for thought instead of conventional "right answers."

In summary, then, developmental findings on moral stages, moral-philosophic conceptions of principles, and the tenets of constitutional democracy cohere to define a philosophically and psychologically viable conception of moral education. Though outlined in 1909 by John Dewey, this conception has only recently gained the research support needed to make it truly convincing. The concept still remains to be tried by American schools. ■

1. J. Piaget, *The Moral Judgment of the Child* (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1948).
2. L. Kohlberg, "Stage and Sequence: the Cognitive-Developmental Approach to Socialization," in D. Goslin, ed., *Handbook of Socialization: Theory and Research* (Rand McNally, 1969).
3. J. Dewey, *Moral Principles in Education* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1909); J. Dewey and O. Tufts, *Ethics* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1934).
4. L. Kohlberg, "Stages of Moral Development as a Basis for Moral Education," in C. Beck and E. Sullivan, eds., *Moral Education* (University of Toronto Press, 1971); L. Kohlberg, "From Is to Ought: How to Commit the Naturalistic Fallacy and Get Away with it in the Study of Moral Development," in T. Mischel, ed., *Cognitive Development and Epistemology* (New York: Academic Press, 1971).
5. C. Holstein, "Parental Determinants of Moral Development," in L. Kohlberg and E. Turiel, eds., *Recent Research in Moral Development* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973).
6. M. Bar-Yam and L. Kohlberg, "Development of Moral Judgment in the Kibbutz," in L. Kohlberg and E. Turiel, op. cit.
7. M. Blatt and L. Kohlberg, "The Effects of Classroom Discussion on the Development of Moral Judgment," in L. Kohlberg and E. Turiel, op. cit.
8. J. Hickey, "Effects of an Experimental Program on the Moral Development of Prisoners," in L. Kohlberg and E. Turiel, op. cit.

The following essay by Nancy Bauer may be viewed as occupying a middle ground between the two conceptions of values offered here. It argues for both a Kohlbergian developmental perspective, yet sees the need for developing shared political values. This tension is presented as a dilemma: "American Education is as paradoxical as American ideals. American education is asked to be individualized and value each child's uniqueness and to get all children to participate as citizens at reasonable levels of understanding and competence. In the society we aim at justice through democracy. In education we aim at shared goals and equal opportunity with individualism."

Nancy Bauer is a Social Studies specialist at The University of Pennsylvania. This selection is excerpted from "The Development of Effective Moral Decision-Making Through Social Studies" and first appeared in The Georgia Social Science Journal, Volume VIII, No. 1, Fall 1976.

The Development of Effective Moral Decision-Making
Through Social Studies

Nancy W. Bauer

I. Common Goals

Citizens of all ages in every culture of the world share a concern about justice and a desire for a more workable world.

Parents, teachers, administrators, and students throughout the United States not only share in those global goals but also share a tired but hopeful list of educational goals for American students. Everyone wants everyone to have the skills to make the world more workable and the emotional concern to want to use those skills to make living as humane as possible for everyone. Justice is both an overarching goal and a standard. We would like students to value competence and justice. We want them to treat each other in an increasingly just manner.

There is a good deal of nation-wide agreement on what an individual person needs in order to participate fully in search of such practical, but humane living.

Everyone needs to know enough--first to survive, secondly to cope, and finally to help.

If people do not know enough, the wheel must be rediscovered, mistakes must be replicated, and even well-meaning, hard-working people will be doomed to wasting energy and time, marked by saying, "I'm sorry."

Because "facts" do not necessarily add up to workable knowledge and because information must continually be uncovered, organized, interpreted, and evaluated, we are all in agreement that our

American students need to learn how to get and use information on their own and in a common mode.

If they share a method, they can both receive and communicate knowledge from and to a wide range of other people. In our society in which so many diverse interests are involved every time we try to use what we know, it becomes essential to have a common way of analyzing, synthesizing, and presenting information. We, therefore, have identified logic, or reasoning, or "thinking skills", or cognitive skills--in order to have a thorough way of gathering and communicating "knowledge" to those who are involved with us in applying it.

The need to know and the need to know how to know are agreed upon goals for Americans because

We have no choice but to work towards the global goals through some kind of consensus of diverse individuals and groups acting freely.

It is this crucial point of methodology--how the decisions will be made--that is also a crucial factor in our philosophical goals. The method of consensus, or a covenant among free individuals, represents belief in the importance of an individual person's ability to commit himself to others. After all, the goals of justice and workability are not the sole concern of democracies; they apply equally well to the realm of the philosopher-king. What is unique to democracy--and particularly our American democracy--is the insistence on a covenant of individuals, each freely making his or her own decision to build a more humane society. That is the rub. Many people take refuge in a position that lack of agreement, like variety, is a sure sign of democracy. Even democracies need not be afraid to advocate democracy as both a method and a goal. We need not be afraid of "training people" to judge themselves by high standards of being able to tolerate differences and to make decisions with people who differ. Moral causes can be shared. One does not have to live totally alone to be free. The key to training American students in moral decision-making and the key to structuring Social Studies is our paradoxical goal of justice through consensus of free individuals.

Social Studies is a study about people. Why we study it and how we study it is crucial. It is not true that any teacher's or text's position is as good as any other. The training of American students must be committed to the same goals and the same standards as the goals and standards of our ideals. Practices designed to uphold those goals should be encouraged. Practices which detract from those goals should be eliminated. Practices which do neither should be held of lesser priority than those that may advance children in their ability to recognize and work toward an increasingly just society.

Assumption and Paradoxes

American educators are charged with the responsibility of helping children from a variety of backgrounds and with every level of ability. How can a teacher deal with differences and with equality? How much freedom shall the child have?

The task is to bring each child to a point where he or she is competent enough and strong enough and aware enough to be free and to contribute to a better society. This is the educational version of the great paradox on which the American community was built. Freedom of the individual to act, as he wishes in his own best interest coupled with equality of all individuals in their opportunities to participate. Liberty and justice. American education is asked to be individualized and value each child's uniqueness and to get all children ready to participate as citizens at reasonable levels of understanding and competence.

In the society we aim at justice through democracy. In education we aim at shared goals and equal opportunity with individualism.

Assumptions

There are specific assumptions on which our American system is

based. If every individual is to be able to make thoughtful decisions, then every individual is assumed to be capable of analyzing a situation, weighing its parts, and synthesizing or putting it together again in ways that are consonant with the goals. Piaget's research assures us that we are safe in assuming that individuals can be taught to gather data, analyze it, synthesize ideas from it, hypothesize, apply their thoughts to new experiences and revise their hypotheses when necessary.

We, therefore, assume that training to think logically is possible, just as we believe that logical thinking is necessary.

Our second assumption is that in a diverse world interaction among people who differ is a constant. Interaction in America is a fairly good example of interaction on a global scale, since ours is, perhaps, the most diverse society in which democratically derived consensus is an avowed goal. Such interaction is bound to produce dissonance and probably conflict. Interaction and conflict, Piaget tells us, are not just frustrating American barriers to consensus. Interaction and conflict are also the social setting in which individuals learn to think at increasingly higher levels. It is some comfort to know that controlled interchange of the differences found in every American neighborhood and classroom can be assumed to be a helpful setting for training people to analyze ideas, test them, and revise them.

Our third assumption is derived from the second, that finding oneself in a situation in which people's interests and values differ is "the American way". Each American, whether he reasons well or not, lives in a multi-valued environment with the eighteenth century belief that freedom means being free from restraint by other people's interests and values. All of our goals must be achieved in this American setting in which disagreement is constant and yet consensus among individuals is both an article of belief and the most realistic method.

We must try to provide for social growth toward justice in a society where material success is valued for all, but it is recognized that first come were the first served. We want children to be able to have empathy for others, live with the reality of disagreement, and yet, remain concerned about the distance between the relations we have and the just relations we hope to achieve.

For some it is enough to preach that children should "be fair" in sports, "share the blocks" in kindergarten, line up in the cafeteria, and not write on someone else's walls.

This is not moral obligations to one's fellows. It is merely keeping out of each other's way. This paper goes beyond that stance of conflict prevention. Beyond fairness is empathy and acting in a humane way. Beyond sharing are common causes. Beyond respect for the property of others are the obligations of citizenship and membership in the human race.

Our final assumption is that the formal study of people--Social Studies, or the social sciences and the humanities--ought to provide some kind of natural setting for social growth in the direction of our goals. Social studies educators and historians must find and maintain suitable connections between what we want the children to be and what we teach about other people.

Moral decision-making toward principles of human justice in a workable world can be the honest work of Social Studies, if the paradox is accepted as real, if all the goals are worked on simultaneously, and if none of the assumptions is set aside.

II. The fragments: one strategy at a time

What happens when philosophical goals and educational assumptions are translated into educational programs for children in school? Often the sense of direction is lost and the assumptions are dropped. Planners for children mean well, but somehow their work lacks the cohesiveness necessary to long-range effort and possible success. Educators at universities who are involved in research on moral decision-making unfortunately tend to focus on a single aspect of a complex philosophical process. A fragment of the total may be a proper subject for research, but it can create serious problems when it is "taught" to student teachers and passed on to supervisors, coordinators, and experienced classroom teachers in workshops, consulting sessions, and in-service days.

The innovative years since the mid-sixties have seen question-asking lessons, thinking level lessons, values-clarification lessons, and moral dilemma discussion lessons. Many of these have been thought of as skills lessons. Each skill is seen as part of a process. Teachers who took the lessons were supposed to gain the skills and incorporate them into their teachings.

A good many college professors and supervisors bewail the fact that teachers do not easily incorporate these insights and practices into their daily teaching. Why, they ask, does the textbook outlast the in-service session? Teachers, too, bewail the fact that the "experts" don't recognize the difficulty of weaving these "strategies into the content lessons of history and social science. Why is it that strategies that are plugged in or pasted on tend to disappear?

I believe that the chief reason for the failure is that these are indeed "strategies", processes, or skills. They have not always grown out of a philosophy of teaching. They have not had natural connections to the meaning we gain from and the use we make of the hard facts of the academic disciplines. Why we teach is our philosophy of life and what we teach is what we value of the achievement of the world. These are obviously more permanent than "skills" and methodology. Methodology must be tied in so that it is valued as a necessary partner to philosophy and learning.

Having established democratic goals and their accompanying assumptions, let us look briefly at some of the process fragments that have had periods of popularity. Why have they failed to catch on? What has been the effect on education through Social Studies?

Question-asking

The difference between open-ended, productive questions and closed, right-and-wrong-answer questions has been a major subject in teacher education and curriculum design. In question-asking lessons teachers are encouraged to ask more open-ended ones.

Both kinds, however, have their proper place. "How did Eskimos adapt to the climate?" "What is John Winthrop's argument?" Teachers do (and should) continue to ask them. Those questions are often downgraded in question-asking lessons, however, because they are compared to questions that have a reason to be open-ended, as if both types fulfilled the same purpose or upheld the same value.

"How many ways out of this situation can you think of? With what probable results?" "Do you believe that decision to be workable? Do you believe it to be just or fair?" These questions are open-ended because the situations in reality have more than one outcome and different values really would be enhanced by different decisions.

Why don't teachers make up open-ended questions and use them with their Social Studies lessons? Because in too many cases textbooks present cut versions or summaries of the facts to save space. It is not the teacher's fault that an open-ended question cannot be asked. Teachers do ask open-ended questions when the facts of the history and social studies texts give the students something to question about. In order to ask "How many ways out can you think of?" the text material has first to be presented with all of the known conditions set up side-by-side. Then the text-writer has to step aside, let the question be asked, and let the students try to answer it. For question-asking to be sound, the historical and scientific evidence has to be complete and accurate. For question-asking to involve values and priorities, the author has to refrain from making all the judgements.

On Training in Logic, Thinking, Inquiry and Concept Formation

John Dewey's steps in learning and Hilda Taba's levels of thinking have made us all aware of movement within what we call the logical process from concrete to abstract thinking. "Thinking lessons" have helped make us aware. Taba's questioning strategies have helped us work whole classrooms of children at one time.

A reason why many teachers do not use these strategies regularly is, once again, the narrative expository-essay style of most textbooks. There are facts to gather, but the text does most

of the classifying, comparing, labeling, and generalizing. No wonder many teachers would rather photocopy pieces of information. Then their students can work with them without the deadly summaries of the textbook author who had all the fun of working with the evidence.

There is another difficulty in separating logical thinking practice from moral decision-making. Many people who teach "thinking" assume that logical or critical thinking is enough as an objective. To focus solely on teaching children to be rational is not enough for the goals set forth here. "Thinking skills" and "inquiry" do not guarantee or necessarily even lead to concern for moral decision-making. There was a time, particularly in the Camelot years of pilot projects, when many of us believed that any thinking person would end up caring about a more humane world. This viewpoint has now brought us "old-time liberals" to a peak of frustration as we have had to recognize that irrational people may have reasons for being so. We cannot ignore their reasons because we abhor their irrationality. Their reasons are part of the diverse reality we must live with. Their reasons must be included in our moral decision-making because we are a democracy. We cannot teach a thinking skills or inquiry curriculum and "plug in the values" at the end of a chapter or on Human Relations Friday. Most teachers know you cannot separate what you know and how you know it from what you care about and what you are going to do with your knowledge.

On Values Clarification

There have been too many detached lessons on values clarification. When, in an effort to make people aware that they have values, the teacher or the curriculum presents a continuum of positions and asks students to decide where they stand, the presenters have set up a false model of reality. There are usually not "two poles" or just "two sides to any question." It becomes a gimmick or a game; it is enjoyed and discarded. "We did that last year."

Teaching children and their teachers to view the world as two-dimensional is, in addition, academically questionable. Values of all participants and those affected by a moral decision should certainly be identified and understood. Discovering the intricate relationships among those differing values should, however, be the work of the students, not the manipulators. Students must learn to recognize that people can choose the same option for different reasons and different options for similar reasons. "Two sides" is over simplified, academically unsound, and contrived. Teachers of history and social science cannot find real life examples that actually fit on a continuum. The study of reality is more like the examination of a network. Values clarification exercises, therefore, often remain just that--limited exercises.

What standards should we apply to values clarification and why? Values should have to be clarified in the context of the bigger picture of reality and on the way to having to make a decision, defend it, and take the consequence for it. Values must also be measured against universals or we end up preaching that "it doesn't make any difference what you believe. Each person should do his own thing." "Isn't diversity wonderful?"

Separate values clarification exercises are no doubt good for awareness of values but detrimental to trying to reach a consensus toward a more humane world. Values clarification is a middle step. When it is separated from the rest of the learning process and from the rest of the facts, it leads to the feeling that, "Before, I sensed that there was something I didn't like about you but I couldn't put my finger on it. Since values clarification, I know why I can't stand you." Moral decision-making in Social Studies has a responsibility to help American students learn how to live with those differences and still try to live by common moral standards.

On Using Moral Dilemmas

One of the newest fragments to be added to the teacher's repertoire is the "moral dilemma", a short story about which the student must make a decision and defend it. There are currently three major difficulties with plugging in moral dilemma practice into the Social Studies program. These difficulties involve lowering other standards teachers have for their students.

First of all, some practitioners ask students, "What would you do if you were Mr. X? Why?" Whether Mr. X is an actual historical character or not, such a question confuses historical judgment with moral judgment. It is not academically sound to ask, "What would you do or how would you feel if you were Jefferson?" It is academically sound to ask, "Given what Jefferson knew and given his values, priorities, and emotional state, what might he do about slavery?" For that kind of historical decision-making students must be given full information to accompany the presentation of the dilemma.

One can also ask, "Given your moral standards, do you think Jefferson did the right thing?" That is asking students to judge Jefferson as they would judge themselves by universal standards of morality. It is, however, very different from evaluating Jefferson in his historical setting. Both are valid exercises. But historical judgment and moral judgment must never be confused or interchanged. When they are interchanged in lessons, students make sloppy historical judgments because they are ignoring the facts. When the historical argument is used in moral judgments, students end up saying, "Well everyone else was doing it at that time, so it is not wrong."

A second difficulty with some strategists who promote moral dilemmas is their propensity to rig the dilemma either to promote one point of view or to fix it so that there will have to be disagreement. This is often done by limiting the information given

given to the students. This deliberately over-simplifies the issues involved so that the preferred way out is highlighted ("How should the new boy on the block be treated? Should he be ignored or invited to play?")

Sometimes dilemmas are rigged to highlight one moral boxing match, such as "love vs. honesty" ("Would you steal the medicine to save your wife?") Such a rigged question around a rigged dilemma does not allow students to introduce other alternatives or to see other issues. (I'd call the Red Cross." I'd ask the bank for a loan.")

Just as pushing one preferred point of view allows for no one "getting it" or everyone "getting it", so rigging the discussion for one end or purpose will have the same effect. For example, if the curriculum or the teacher concludes in advance that "the concept or issue here is justice", or "the conflict here is between conformity to law and the value of human life," the role of student is rigged. Students are frustrated if the lesson or discussion does not allow for their perceptions. What if some students see another issue, or another conflict, or some see no conflict, or simply find a practical way out? In the mind of the dilemma-selector, these views bypass "the point", and the students are often ignored or held to one line of argument. In such cases the idea of moral decision-making becomes a game. When a discussion is molded in that way, students, parents, and teachers have every right to object to being manipulated. And one hopes they will.

These contrived moral dilemmas and manipulated discussions have real places as research techniques where some of the variables must be held constant so that the responses of the participants can be coded and scored. From a philosophical as well as academic viewpoint, however, the contrived point of view or the single-minded purpose are, in the view of this writer, not totally intellectually honest. They are certainly inadequate means towards the goals of Social Studies in America. As we pursue our goals through a real world of diversity, we must be honest with ourselves and with the students. The greatest conflict of values may be over which values are involved in this situation or "what's the problem?" We have no moral or academic right to prevent students from approaching a situation for their own reasons and from their own perspectives. There may be more concepts and issues inherent in a situation than the designers were able to perceive.

To deny the students the role of analyzer is to restrict them, oversimplify the lesson, and possibly distort the reality which the lesson is trying to represent. Every skilled and experienced teacher knows the excitement of teaching a student who can go beyond the teacher's own perception and insight. To build a curriculum that is limited to the perceptions and insights of its creators is arrogance in the guise of clear organization and oversimplified, one-at-a-time behavioral objectives. Curriculum designers in a democracy may openly set the agenda. They may not limit or control the perspectives of the participants...

An alternative conception of the values to be taught by citizen educators is offered by the tradition of "civic idealism." Drawing principally from classical Greek political theory, this tradition conceives of politics not as the reconciliation of competing strands of self-interest, but as the search for shared standards of social justice. To civic idealists therefore, the function of education is inseparable from preparation for political participation in the arena of public policy.

The first piece was written by Paul Levy for inclusion within this volume.

Ideals Worthy of Respect
Paul R. Levy

"You must choose to educate either the citizen or the man." These were the alternatives that Rousseau posed in his Emile. Either one cultivates the talents and feelings of the inner person or one educates for public service, for citizenship, for social responsibility. It is a choice every serious educator has had to ponder wherever traditional norms and inherited beliefs have lost their appeal, their authority and their regulating function. Either one abets in the process of social disintegration and fosters the skills of the private self as did the Athenian Sophists of the 5th Century B.C., or one seeks, as did Plato, new social principles and binding ideals truly worthy of respect.

To be sure, there have been educational traditions individualist in orientation that have sought to elevate the vision of the individual beyond the narrow horizons of mere self-interest. In the nineteenth century the German tradition of Bildung, of "character formation", upheld the aristocratic ideal of the "fully cultivated individual"--educated, lively and magnanimous in spirit. It was a tradition Greek in inspiration, but fundamentally antipolitical in intention. Withdrawal from the demands of the city and social life was an essential pre-condition for the arduous task of moral self-development. At its best however, the ideal never suggested a self-indulgent wallowing in romanticized nature. For in the eyes of its foremost American spokesperson, Ralph Waldo Emerson, even nature posited a moral imperative:

The sunset is unlike anything that is underneath it: it wants man.
And the beauty of nature must always seem unreal and mocking, until
the landscape has human figures, that are as good as itself. If
there were good men, there would never be this rapture in nature...

Mr. Levy holds a Ph.D. in History and Political Theory from Columbia University, is an adjunct lecturer at the Community College of Philadelphia and is the Curriculum Development Coordinator for the Institute for the Study of Civic Values.

...Man is fallen; nature is erect and serves as a differential thermometer, detecting the presence or absence of the divine sentiment in man. By fault of our dullness and selfishness, we are looking up to nature, but when we are convalescent, nature will look up to us. We see the foaming brook with compunction: if our own life flowed with the right energy, we should shame the brook. (1.)

But there is little left in American culture of this type of ideal, nor of the exemplary moral solitude of a man like Thoreau. Instead, individualism in America has become little more than what the conservative critic Andrew Hacker has termed a swarming mass of "two hundred million egos"--a rather gigantic and grotesque Mormon Tabernacle Choir with ever member humming "Me."

Historically, liberal individualism was not always so monotonous and monosyllabic. As a political ideology that came fully into its own at the beginning of the nineteenth century in Europe, it battled strenuously against feudal privilege, church dogma, and the denial of political rights. Under its banner an immense variety of creative energies were unleashed and great strides were made in extending material goods to the widest number and in securing fundamental human liberties. But today, having vanquished all its traditional foes, it stands uninspiringly like a flabby and aging boxer, aimlessly swaying from side to side.

Liberal individualism in the hands of most students in our colleges and universities today has become little more than the anemic creed: "Everything is permissible, so long as it doesn't hurt anyone." Small wonder that our political ideals today command so little respect. It should not be surprising too, that so many middle-class adolescents are lured by a variety of exotic cults that promise exactly those things that their lives so lack: form, direction, community and guiding ideals. All too often within these sects one encounters mindless authoritarianism substituted for freely chosen goals. Small wonder too that we need psychologists and journalists to tell us of stages of personal development and the rites of passage essential to social maturation that every self-respecting culture historically has provided automatically to its members. Is it surprising then, that so many adults have so readily paid hundreds and hundreds of dollars for a variety of therapies that offer instant revelation, glib insights, and pre-packaged systems of belief by which they might interpret their amorphous lives? Everywhere in American culture today there are sophists of self-help peddling their wares.

What then is the task of the educator? One clear alternative is to enter the fray and teach whatever is fashionable and flattening. A recent article by Sally Helgesen in Harpers, "Students of the Subjective," offers us a sample of this sort of educational approach. In the effort to bolster sagging enrollments in its adult education program, the New School for Social Research is offering "classes in learning how to live": "Body Awareness 101", "Couple Communication", "Being-Single" and "Psycho Karate." Here students "share their experiences" and "dialogue with their negative energies" and thereby solve neuroses, hemorrhoids and constipation. Once, this sort of structureless teaching to the

lowest common denominator was called "pandering"--today it is called "self-actualization."

A second alternative, and one far more worthy of the name education takes quite another approach. It emphasizes first, the need for speaking old, and sometimes unpopular truths. When liberalism first began to emerge triumphant in Europe in the 19th century, there were any number of observers, conservative and radical alike, who asked: "Beyond your critical and destructive task, what new social values do you offer? What new organic and binding principles beyond naked self-interest do you propose once you have eroded and devalued all traditional restraints?" These are the questions true educators must ask not only of adolescents, engaged in the necessary process of questioning all customary and parental restraints, but of any group that seeks power to alter the status quo? What positive vision do you have to offer?

Second, an educator should seek to re-activate and restore what was worthy in older presently discredited values. Reverend Jesse Jackson's speech, "Give the People a Vision", included in the section on Empowerment, is an excellent example of a leader recalling that self-discipline, self-respect, education and cooperative organization have always been the most powerful ways for dispossessed groups to raise themselves out of squalor, self-pity and misery. John Schaar's essay, "The Case for Patriotism", included here as well, is another important attempt to restore meaning and integrity to dying values. "We are not taught," he notes, "to define our lives by our debts and legacies, but by our rights and opportunities." Thus, each pursues self-interest and upward mobility without ever questioning the consequences. As a result, we have become a people "to whom the experience of displacement is so natural that we do not know we are displaced, and it is hard for us to appreciate how desolating the experience can be for others." "In earlier times," he adds:

...when people were enclosed in narrow circles of experience and devotion, the proper vocation of education was to call them out of the parochial, urging them toward higher and more general loyalties. But now the situation is different and perhaps the task of education is different too." (2.)

This then is the third task: to initiate a resurgence of local participation and to restore the sense of political community. To be certain, Schaar advises that we separate patriotism from chauvinistic nationalism, which he considers to be "patriotism's bloody brother." Indeed, this must be central to our work: separating true political values off from the culture of trash in which they have become mired.* Students and adults whose experience of America is limited by "Baseball, Hot Dogs, Apple Pie and Chevrolet", whose knowledge of nature comes from Salem Cigarettes and Herbal Essence Shampoo, and to whom "Freedom of Choice" means selecting

*Norman Thomas' comment on the anti-draft demonstrations of the 1960's is very much in order here: "I would not burn the American flag," he advised the protestors: "Instead, I would wash it."

between a Big Mac and a Whopper Burger, ought to be told that they know nothing of patriotism, nature, or freedom of choice. Likewise, we should reject the diluted conception of "participation" that views it as no more than the ritual pulling of a plastic lever and the tuning in for instant televised results once every four years. One has only to read Rousseau's caustic remarks on "representative government" included in the section on Participation to recall to what the phrase "participatory democracy" once referred. We come back then to our theme: when we speak of "values" we must not offer impoverished platitudes, but civic ideals worthy of respect.

There is perhaps no better place to relearn the true values of community and citizenship than the Funeral Oration of Pericles, the Athenian. A sense of reverence toward the past, a secure openness to the present and a spirit of adventurousness in facing the future--these were some of the qualities Pericles asserted that made the city of Athens and "education to all Greece." Even more important was the governing ethic of social responsibility: "We do not say that a man who takes no interest in politics is a man who minds his own business; we say that he has no business here at all." (3.) Even when disaster struck Athens in the form of a killing plague that undermined confidence in religious values and respect for the law, Pericles re-iterated his theme: "My own opinion is that when the whole state is on the right course it is a better thing for each separate individual than when private interests are satisfied and the state as a whole is going downhill." (4.) In short, especially in periods of institutional crisis, one ought to choose the citizen over the man.

This is not to say that one neglects, or even worse, attempts to obliterate individuality. In this regard, Pericles was quite specific in urging tolerance toward the private opinions and pursuits of men. But he did insist that in crucial civic matters of education and politics, our aim must not be to enhance the powers of the private self, but rather to aid in the search for public values and goals inspiring enough to lift us above lethargy and sullen self-indulgence.

- 1.) Ralph Waldo Emerson, Essays, (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1926) p. 387.
- 2.) John Schaar, "The Case for Patriotism" New American Review, 1972, p. 80.
- 3.) Thucydides, The Peloponnesian War, (Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1972,) p. 147.
- 4.) Ibid., p. 158.

What are the pre-conditions for the re-establishment of such a sense of public morality or civil religion? Is it realistic in modern, industrial society? The following piece by John Schaar makes specific recommendations as to the attitudes and sentiments citizen educators should seek to instill if they wish to restore respect for civic ideals.

The Case for Patriotism

John H. Schaar

I intend to write something of a plea for patriotism. That intention is so uncongenial to almost everybody who is likely to read the essay that I want to spell it out with some care. In doing this, I wish not to disarm the critics, but to help them find the right target.

Consider first the state of opinion and sentiment on the subject.

Patriotism is unwelcome in many quarters of the land today, and unknown in many others. There is virtually no thoughtful discussion of the subject, for the word has settled, in most people's minds, deep into a brackish pond of sentiment where thought cannot reach. Politicians and members of patriotic associations praise it, of course, but official and professional patriotism too often sounds like nationalism, patriotism's bloody brother. On the other hand, patriotism has a bad name among many thoughtful people, who see it as a horror at worst, a vestigial passion largely confined to the thoughtless at best: as enlightenment advances, patriotism recedes. The intellectuals are virtually required to repudiate it as a condition of class membership. The radical and dropout young loathe it. Most troublesome of all, for one who would make the argument I intend to make, is the fact that both the groups that hate and those that glorify patriotism largely agree that it and nationalism are the same thing. I hope to show that they are different things--related, but separable.

Opponents of patriotism might agree that if the two could be separated then patriotism would look fairly attractive. But the opinion is widespread, almost atmospheric, that the separation is impossible, that with the triumph of the nation-state, nationalism has indelibly stained patriotism: the two are warp and woof. The argument against patriotism goes on to say that, psychologically considered, patriot and nationalist are the same: both are characterized by exaggerated love for one's own collectivity combined with more or less contempt and hostility toward outsiders. In addition, advanced political opinion holds that positive, new ideas and forces--e.g., internationalism, universal humanism, economic interdependence, socialist solidarity--are healthier bonds of unity, and more to be encouraged than the older ties of patriotism. These are genuine objections, and they are held by many thoughtful people. I shall try to respond to them toward the end of the essay.

The obstacles to speaking for patriotism do not end with brackishness of opinion. For if some people favor patriotism, largely for the wrong reasons, and if some oppose it, largely for the wrong reasons, others hardly think about it at all. Millions of Americans are simply without patriotism, and this large group includes all classes and kinds of persons. They do not think

unpatriotic thoughts, but they do not think patriotic thoughts either. The republic for them is a vague and distant thing, absent from their hearts, lost to their eyes. Reflecting this indifference, our great patriotic holidays, now administratively arranged to provide long weekends, are less occasions for shared remembrance and renewal of the political covenant than boosts to the consumer economy. That modern compendium of man's knowledge of man, the International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, apparently agrees that patriotism is a nonthing, for it is silent on the subject.

There is another obstacle to discussion. The word patriotism is a member of a family of words and largely takes its meanings from its membership. Some other members of the family are legacy, covenant, reverence, loyalty, nurture, roots, citizen, debt, gift, republic. These words, which once clarified the matter, today encounter the same barrier of mystification-distrust-indifference as does patriotism itself. All these words must appear in the discussion: there are no satisfactory alternatives. Furthermore, these words cannot be cut out of our political lives as easily as they have been dropped from our encyclopedia. If we lose them, it will not be easy to find replacements, and we may learn too late that the loss was grievous. Still, many people do not now share this view of the matter, and this sets a difficult obstacle in the path of discussion.

Patriotism has certainly declined in the United States. Nor is this decline the result of recent or transient causes. Most of the widely known patriotic associations were formed in the last decade of the nineteenth century, which suggests that as the natural springs of patriotic sentiment dried up, the land had to be irrigated. By now the land is so parched that even if American participation in the war in Southeast Asia does come to an end, along with all the reports of American corruption and exploitation at home and abroad, I doubt whether we would love this country any the more, although we would despise it less.

I have little hope that my plea for patriotism will succeed, and much anxiety that it will be heard by many as fatuous or wrong-headed. Citizens would not need the argument, and non-citizens probably cannot hear it. Still, I shall make the argument. I do so partly out of blockheadedness, partly out of a wish to repay a welcome debt to patriotic predecessors and contemporaries, and partly for two reasons that might carry more weight. The first reason stems from my affection and respect for fellow-citizens, and from my wish to see them even more respectable than they are. We have lost patriotism. Although many count the loss small, and many others do not know it has occurred, I believe that the loss is great. The second reason stems from my wish to see a revitalized radical politics in this country, and from my conviction that Susan Sontag is correct when she says that "probably no serious radical movement has any future in America unless it can revalidate the tarnished idea of patriotism." (1.) The radicals of the 1960s did not

persuade their fellow-Americans, high or low, that they genuinely cared for and shared a country with them. And no one who has contempt for others can hope to teach those others. A revived radicalism must be a patriotic radicalism. It must share and care for the common things, even while it has a "lovers quarrel" with fellow-citizens.

I

NATURAL PATRIOTISM

Since patriotism is a complex and dangerous word, we must give some care to definition. But not too much care, for like all the important political words, it cannot be protected against the vicissitudes of history and passion; and not the wrong kind of care either, for the word comes not from the laboratory but from life. The word will not hold still while we attach a single, universal meaning to it, but we can describe a nucleus of meanings.

At its core, patriotism means love of one's homeplace, and of the familiar things and scenes associated with the homeplace. In this sense, patriotism is one of the basic human sentiments. If not a natural tendency in the species, it is at least a proclivity produced by realities basic to human life, for territoriality, along with family, has always been a primary associative bond. We become devoted to the people, places and ways that nurture us, and what is familiar and nurturing seems also natural and right. This is the root of patriotism. Furthermore, we are all subject to the immense power of habit, and patriotism has habit in its service. Even if we leave the homeplace for a larger world, finding delight in its variety and novelty, we delight as much in returning to familiar things. The theme of homecoming is the central motif of patriotic discourse, as old and as deep as the return of Odysseus from Troy, and the feeling is always the same:

When we saw the top of the mountain from Albuquerque we wondered if it was our mountain, and we felt like talking to the ground, we loved it so, and some of the old men and women cried with joy when they reached their homes. (2.)

The other side of the case is the melancholy figure of the lone wanderer, or of the Stoic whose "my home is everywhere" meant he had a home nowhere.

To be a patriot is to have a patrimony; or, perhaps more accurately, the patriot is one who is grateful for a legacy and recognizes that the legacy makes him a debtor. There is a whole way of being in the world, captured best by the word reverence, which defines life by its debts: one is what one owes, what one acknowledges as a rightful debt or obligation. The patriot moves within that mentality. The gift of land, people, language, gods, memories, and customs, which is the patrimony of the patriot, defines what he or she is. Patrimony is mixed with person; the two are barely separable. The very tone and rhythm of a life, the shapes of perception, the texture of its homes and fears come from membership in a territorially rooted group. The con-

scious patriot is one who feels deeply indebted for these gifts, grateful to the people and places through which they come, and determined to defend the legacy against enemies and pass it unspoiled to those who will come after.

But such primary experiences are nearly inaccessible to us. We are not taught to define our lives by our debts and legacies, but by our rights and opportunities. Robert Frost's stark line, "This land was ours, before we were the land's." condenses the whole story of American patriotism. We do not and cannot love this land the way the Greek and Navaho loved theirs. The graves of some of our ancestors are here, to be sure, but most of us would be hard pressed to find them: name and locate the graves of your great-grandparents. The land was not granted to us in trust by a Great Spirit, nor are there in this land a thousand places sacred to lesser deities. Having purged ourselves of pantheism, we do not dwell in a realm alive with sacred groves and fountains. (3.) We are all doctrinal monotheists and our only patriotic god is the god of battles. We took the land from others whom we regarded as of no account. The land itself we saw as a resource for comfort and power available to all who had the strength to take it. Among us, only persons (artificial as well as natural) have rights. The homestead has none. We may buy, sell, and use it as we wish. It has no claims we need heed or even hear. Still today, and even in the ecology movement, the same attitude prevails: Save Our Coast. Still possession, not union and stewardship.

Perhaps this lack of natural patriotism is some part of the explanation of American restlessness and rootlessness. (4.) When Europeans first came to this land they saw nothing but savages in a howling wilderness, both of which had to be conquered. Seeking neither welcome nor permission from those already here, they imposed their alien god and ways on the "new land." That original act of conquest and sacrilege was repeated innumerable times as the wave rolled west, until now the very land accuses the intruders. There can be no experience of homecoming without welcome, and we shall not feel welcome here until we learn how to ask it of those who alone have it to give. That we may be slowly coming to understand this is one of the few hopeful signs for American patriotism.

Perhaps it is impossible to know whether the nature of the conquest helped produce American restlessness and rootlessness, but it is certain that the restlessness and rootlessness in their turn make a natural patriotism nearly impossible. The seeds of patriotism can germinate even on the stoniest ground, but they must have time to put down roots. We are a nation on the go, always moving, and always with somewhere left to move to. Many of us now even have mobile homes, with no roots in the earth at all. The purpose of life is to get ahead, and getting ahead means leaving others behind--an outlook, I think, which makes us distinctive among the nomadic peoples. There is little piety toward the past and the future is something to be conquered. Ages and generations of care are required for the nurturing of that primary patriotism of place which has been a treasured and defining experience of most of humankind. In recent American letters, perhaps only William Faulkner, Robert Frost, and Edmund Wilson wrote

in the language of natural patriotism--and Wilson became querulous toward the end. We are a people to whom the experience of displacement is so natural that we do not know we are displaced, and it is hard for us to appreciate how desolating the experience can be for others. The following words were written by a Laotian poet pleading for a way of life now destroyed by American bombs:

Pity--our houses, ricefields, inheritance--we must abandon. The ricefields will grow jungles. They will become a wild place filled with tigers. Have pity; the lands, the ponds with fish, everything; pity the bathing hole where no one will come to swim and muddy the cool waters. Pity the crabs, fish, game, bamboo shoots; our kind of food. Sorrow for the fruit trees we planted in the garden and around the village, the clumps of large and small bamboo; have pity!....The day does not exist when we will forget. (6.)

Can we for whom "relocation" means moving elsewhere in the pursuit of income and opportunity understand this? Have we found satisfactory substitutes for it in batting averages, or color television, or flights to the moon?

In sum, then, that kind of patriotism which Tocqueville called instinctive is not available to us. (7.) There is no way to measure the weight of this loss, but if instinctive patriotism is the basic urge I think it is, then the loss is heavy. Surely, human beings can feel the lack of something they need even though they might never have had it. To feel the loss of something, it is not necessary first to have had that thing. (Consider "love", for example, which many psychologists say we all need, even though many of us have never had it.) The trouble is, that when a deprivation is of this sort the victim may not interpret his condition correctly: people attempted all sorts of cures for goiter before they learned about iodine. Not knowing what it is one needs, one mistakes symptoms for the cause, and tries to fill the need through harmful substitutes for the real thing. Perhaps this is the case with us.

Just one step removed from land patriotism is patriotism of the city. Both center on the idea and sentiment of home and nurture. Both acknowledge that they foundation of life is debt. Both shape individual life by reference to the common and familiar things. Their only important difference is in the object of attachment. The city is the creation of human beings and is in that obvious sense artificial, the image of an ideal, while the land, even when altered by labor and love remains fundamentally the work of nature. The supreme expression of city patriotism is to be found in Pericles' eulogy for the Athenian dead, and a study of that discourse will teach one all that can be learned about the subject.

Certainly city patriotism can be as intense as patriotism of the land. Machiavelli cared more for his city than for his own soul. And Fustel de Coulanges' book on The Ancient City describes how much of human life could be founded on the city's gods, exhibited in the city's temples and public spaces, and protected by the city's walls. Each family had its private home and hearth, but the city was a second home, made by all and common to all. City patriotism was profoundly "social" in its

orientations: Socrates did not like to leave Athens for even a day in the country because he could not talk with trees.

City patriotism, then, is not profoundly different from land patriotism, though it is a step beyond it in the direction of the artificial and the ideal. Like land patriotism, it too is declining. In the times when cities were few, they were precious to their citizens by reason of their very artificiality. A small man-made thing protected by its walls from the vast wilderness without, the city nourished a life which was distinctively human. As time went on, the works of the humankind appeared everywhere, becoming less valuable as they became more common. That is true the world over. In the United States, in addition, cities have been from the beginning products largely of the impulse of profit and hustle, owing little to the sacred and the traditional. Hence, there is as little of city patriotism among us as there is of the ancient patriotism of place. Furthermore, the people and shapes, as well as the monuments and traditions, of our cities change so rapidly that citizens have no time to form solid and enduring attachments. Even the sports teams, closest modern equivalent to the gods of the ancient city, can be moved by a few million dollars.

II

COVENANTED PATRIOTISM

But if instinctive patriotism and the patriotism of the city cannot be ours, what can be? Is there a type of patriotism peculiarly American: if so, is it anything more than patriotism's violent relative, nationalism?

Abraham Lincoln, the supreme authority on this subject, thought there was a patriotism unique to America. Americans, a motley gathering of various races and cultures, were bonded together not by blood or religion, not by tradition or territory, not by the walls and traditions of a city, but by a political idea. We are a nation formed by a covenant, by dedication to a set of principles, and by an exchange of promises to uphold and advance certain commitments among ourselves and throughout the world. Those principles and commitments are the core of American identity, the soul of the body politic. They make the American nation unique, and uniquely valuable among and to the other nations. But the other side of this conception contains a warning very like the warnings spoken by the prophets to Israel: if we fail in our promises to each other, and lose the principles of the covenant, then we lose everything, for they are we. This makes it quite clear that we are dealing here with a conception very different from Rousseau's advocacy of a civil religion as the bond of political community. For Lincoln, the principles of the covenant set the standard by which the nation must judge itself: the nation is righteous and to be honored only insofar as it honors the covenant. For Rousseau, the civil religion is designed to induce the individual to venerate the nation itself. I shall hope to show that the best way to define the failure of American patriotism is to see it as a decline from the noble example and promise of Lincoln's conception, to the banal performance of Rousseau's.

Lincoln developed and expounded his conception of the national covenant over a number of years and on a number of significant occasions. One of his fullest statements of the idea came when he was about to enter the highest office in the land. On his way to Washington to take up the Presidency, Lincoln was invited to speak in Independence Hall, Philadelphia. Deeply moved by the place, he expressed his understanding of America's meaning and mission in a handful of his own memorable words--and half consciously revealed his own and the nation's future. The whole speech should be read. Here are some critical passages:

I am filled with deep emotion at finding myself standing here in the place where were collected together the wisdom, the patriotism, the devotion to principle, from which sprang the institutions under which we live...I can say...that all the political sentiments I entertain have been drawn...from the sentiments which originated, and were given to the world from this hall in which we stand. I have never had a feeling politically that did not spring from the sentiments embodied in the Declaration of Independence...I have often inquired of myself, what great principle or idea it was that kept this confederacy so long together. It was...something in that Declaration giving liberty, not alone to the people of this country, but hope to the world for all future time. It was that which gave promise that in due time the weights should be lifted from the shoulders of all men, and that all should have an equal choice...

Now, my friends, can this country be saved upon that basis? If it can, I will consider myself one of the happiest men in the world if I can help to save it. If it can't be saved upon that principle, it will be truly awful. But, if this country cannot be saved without giving up that principle--I was about to say I would rather be assassinated on this spot than to surrender it. (8.)

In this discourse Lincoln asserted that the articles of the political covenant are both perfectly clear and grounded in the firmest authority. Three years later, on land consecrated by blood, he repeated the same themes. The nation born in 1776 was "conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." Continuing in unbroken line, generation was tied to generation by that common birth and promise. In a fragment written early in 1861, but not published, Lincoln stated his understanding of the relation between covenant and people--between the Declaration of Independence on the one side and the Constitution and Union on the other. He expressed the connection by a luminous metaphor drawn from the Book of Proverbs. The principle announced in the Declaration he called an "apple of gold," while "the Union and the Constitution are the pictures of silver, subsequently framed around it. The picture was made, not to conceal or destroy the apple; but to adorn and preserve it. The picture was made for the apple--not the apple for the picture." (IV,240)

One more statement, this time from the young Lincoln. Again the occasion is significant. Lincoln had just been elected to the Illinois legislature, and he accepted an invitation to address the Young Men's Lyceum of Springfield: an occasion of beginning, then, like the speech in Independence Hall. Lincoln chose as his theme, "the perpetuation of our political institutions." (I,108-15)

He opened the discourse by reminding his listeners that the men of the Revolution had fought to found a polity dedicated to liberty and self-government. Those principles were safe while the founders lived for they knew the price that had been paid for them. The scenes and memories of the struggle were visible to their eyes and lively to their memories. Many individuals and families treasured and retold the stories of sacrifice and danger. But now these scenes are distant. We who came after the struggle and had no part in it cannot see it in the scars on our bodies, cannot even relive it through the eyes and voices of the actors. Being distant, we easily forget why those others fought and died, and we cannot justly value the gift they gave to us. Our forgetting opens the path to talented persons of great ambition who, if they cannot gain fame by preserving the principles of the founding, will gain fame by wrecking them. Only if the founding principles are kept alive and pure in the minds and hearts of the citizenry shall we be safe from perverted ambition--or, indeed, safe from ourselves. We must, then, see as the chief task of political life the task of political education: inculcate respect for valid laws as a "political religion"; retell on every possible occasion the story of the struggle; teach tirelessly the principles of the founding. The only guardian of the compact is an informed citizenry, and the first task of leadership is the formation of such a citizenry. (9.)

This is a conception of patriotic development that fits a nation as large and heterogeneous as our own. It sets a mission and provides a standard of judgment. It tells us when we are acting justly and it does not confuse martial fervor with dedication to country. Lincoln also reminded us that the covenant is not a static legacy, a gift outright, but a burden and a promise. The nation exists only in repeated acts of remembrance and renewal of the covenant through changing circumstances. Patriotism here is more than a frame of mind. It is also activity guided by and directed toward the mission established in the founding covenant. This conception of political membership also decisively transcends the parochial and primitive fraternities of blood and race, for it calls kin all who accept the authority of the covenant. And finally, this covenanted patriotism assigns America a teaching mission among the nations, rather than a superiority over a hostility toward them. (10.) This patriotism is compatible with the most generous humanism. (11.)

Now, only the willfully blind could fail to see that American patriotism in practice has failed to live up to Lincoln's teaching of the ideal. Most of the reasons are obvious; others are more subtle.

First of all, certain peoples were excluded from the covenant, some from the beginning, some later on: Indians, Negroes, Mexican Americans, Orientals. Then too, from early on, liberty was largely interpreted as private liberty, and equality soon came to mean equal opportunity to compete for the prizes of wealth and power.

There was little teaching of liberty as public liberty--the power of acting with others to shape the conditions of the common life. (Henry Adams thought the political age had ended in 1816, supplanted by the economic age.) The activity of politics was seen as but another of the instrumentalities by which self-interested individuals advanced toward private goals. The very notion of a public good dissolved into an aggregate of particular goods, and Lincoln's conception of the patriotic citizen as one who treasures and upholds the basic principles of the political covenant dissolved along with it. (12.)

Today our skepticism toward all notions of disinterested, public-regarding behavior is so thoroughgoing that the patriot can hardly appear. We are inclined to regard all professions of disinterested and altruistic motive as the blandishments of a charlatan or the intrigues of a schemer--and we are largely right, for over time, a people gets the politics it expects and asks for. When these political conceptions were added to the ethic of competition and mastery in the economic sphere, the ground was prepared for the full flowering of that individualism which Tocqueville diagnosed as the deadliest enemy of civic virtue. In sum, liberalism and capitalism corrupted the covenant, while racism denied it to large groups of the population.

Other forces completed the work which liberalism, capitalism, and racism had begun. The idea and experience of a covenanted community has deeper roots in the American past than those exposed by Lincoln. The Puritan Commonwealth of New England was exactly such a community. Individuals became members of the community only upon acceptance of certain articles of religious faith and morals. That acceptance had to be proved in practice, and to the satisfaction of the guardians of the covenant. Social institutions were designed to encourage performance of the covenant. The Puritans discouraged the formation of isolated, private farmsteads and tried to keep all persons in the towns, in sight of each other, and with life centered in the meetinghouse. In sum, membership was not a right of birth. It had to be earned, and was the reward of choice and effort. Institutions were designed to encourage the choice and supervise the effort.

That idea of earned membership still forms the center of American nationality, but time and circumstances have worked strange changes on it. (13.) As time went on, America opened her doors to the stranger on easy terms. Only one restriction remained: the stranger must not become a republican. He had to accept the fundamental terms of the founding covenant. The Constitution even specifies that each state shall have a republican form of government. We imposed no religious tests for membership, no tests of cultural or linguistic background, no tests--with well-known exceptions--of blood or race. But we did require a profession of republican faith. In that decisive way, the New England idea of earned membership in a covenanted community persisted. It is a fascinating idea, at once universal and generous in that it is willing to embrace as members a great variety

of human and cultural types, rejecting neither Turk nor Greek, qua Turk or Greek, blind to divisions that had for centuries brought the Old World to repression and war; narrow in that it reduced the person to official beliefs, denying the significance of all those other things that go to make up character and style, all those things that human conversation is about.

As time went on, the narrowness prevailed against the generosity. First of all, the social institutions that provided the nursery and school for learning and following the covenant declined. The close New England Town gave way to the isolated homestead, or to the city of recent immigrants. No longer was life lived and tested under the eyes of familiars. Then, the forgetting that Lincoln so feared took its toll so that the gift of public liberty seemed a small one. Our teachers began to teach, and we to value, private life and liberty above all. The growth of capitalist enterprise and the spread of the competitive ethic hastened the work of isolation and privatization. And then, during the last third of the nineteenth century, capitalism became equated with America herself. At the very time when the free enterprise system was being swallowed by the corporate system, the ideology of free enterprise became identified with the spirit of Americanism. Finally, with the huge immigrations of 1890-1920, and with the emergence of the United States as a world power, efforts to assimilate the foreign-born and assure their loyalty were greatly accelerated. More and more we turned to propaganda and to one or another form of loyalty test. An American became one who would not profess certain beliefs or who would not do certain things: from belief in anarchism, to the practice of polygamy, to joining the Communist Party, and on to disavowing the use of revolutionary force and violence. A nation of strangers, ignorant of the most important things about the man next door, we attempted to assure predictable behavior by requiring ritual disavowals of feared beliefs and practices. The quest for consensus in national politics we followed almost naturally--as though patriots were persons who did not disagree, as though patriotism were a matter of professing certain doctrines and supporting the party policies of the day, rather than a steadfast devotion to the founding principles and a disinterested search for the good of the whole.

The "Apple of Gold" tarnished, while we polished the "picture of silver." Rousseau's conception of a civic religion drove out Lincoln's conception of a covenanted citizenry whose patriotism was exercised in active dedication to the promises and goals of the republic.

Even so, Lincoln's idea remains alive as possibly the only saving conception of patriotism possible for us. It is surely the understanding of patriotic duty that inspired the civil rights activity of the 1960s, and that for one glorious moment called more Harvard Seniors, among others, to the Peace Corps than to the Business School. It is the only idea of civic obligation that can provide a full defense for civilly disobeying laws or orders circumscribing liberty or violating the principle of equal justice for all. The idea was expressed by many of the young men who publicly refused conscription during the late 1960s on the grounds that the Vietnam War violated America's obligations to herself and to the nations--expressed not by those who fled or hid, or who used the labyrinth of the law to avoid the

burdens of moral choice and political action, but by those who publically resisted and publicly paid the penalties of resistance.

Lincoln's conception of covenanted patriotism also offers the noblest rationale for active citizenship (government of, by, and for the people) resident in our tradition. Virtually every other argument for participation familiar to Americans starts from the premise of self-interest and sees political participation in exclusively instrumental and economic terms. Seen in this light, SDS's "Port Huron Statement" of 1962, with its conviction that the individual should "share in those social decisions determining the quality and direction of his life," is the finest expression of the Lincolnian idea in recent times. The Port Huron Statement offers a vision of an active and cooperative citizenry who see the political system as their system, and who understand that if the system is to survive according to its own principles, it will survive only by their efforts, and not by the ministrations of an elected monarch and an elite of managers, no matter how benign and competent. Such an elite might be able to keep order and distribute comfort, and might even be able to defend the populace against external enemies and help it adjust to the strains of incessant change at home, but it cannot preserve the system on its own principles. It cannot do that because one of the principles is that the system belongs to the citizens. It is theirs; and at the moment an elite "saves" it for them, at that moment it dies.

Finally, Lincoln's idea proposes a strictly political definition of our nationhood, one which liberates us from the parochialisms of race and religion, and one which severs patriotic devotion from the cult of national power. It is, in my estimation, a calamity that this idea of patriotism has been so corrupted and subverted among us. The work of reviving, purifying, and establishing it is the supreme task of American political education...

- 1.) Trip to Hanoi, (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1968), p. 82.
- 2.) The words are Manuelito's, a chief of the Navaho, describing the return of his people to their ancestral lands. Quoted here from Dee Brown, Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971), p. 35.
- 3.) The early Christians were poor patriots. Their monotheism killed the lesser gods, denuding the land of sacred groves and local shrines. Machiavelli also thought that the Christians were poor patriots.
- 4.) See Chapter 1, "The Spirit of the Place," in D.H. Lawrence's Studies in Classic American Literature for a suggestive development of this theme.
- 5.) These lines were written on Thanksgiving Day, one of the purest of American holidays. And yet, there are complexities to be remembered here as well. The Puritans had not only days of thanksgiving but days of penance too, and they were reluctant to routinize high occasions. They remembered that their plenty was a gift. And what of the Indians? There is not enough whisky in the land to drown their pain on this day when the conquerors feast.

- 6.) Fred Branfman, Voices from the Plain of Jars: Life Under an Air War (New York: Harper and Row, 1972). Quoted here from New York Review of Books, Vol. 19, No. 2 (August 10, 1972), p. 20.
- 7.) Democracy in America (New York: Schocken, 1961), Vol. I. p. 282.
- 8.) Roy P. Basler, ed. Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln (New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1953), Vol. IV, p. 249.
- 9.) Lincoln returned time and again to this theme of forgetting, nowhere more powerfully than in his great speech at Peoria (October 16, 1854) where he argued that the Nebraska bill was but one more step along the path whereby "little by little, but steadily as man's march to the grave, we have been giving up the Old for the New faith." Ibid., Vol. II. p. 275.
- 10.) This mission used to matter to others elsewhere in the world. A report from Russia: "On the morning of the Fourth of July, 1876...hundreds of small, rude American flags or strips of red, white and blue cloth fluttered from the grated windows of the (political prisoners) around the whole quadrangle of the great St. Petersburg prison..." Reported in Ira Woods Howerth, "Patriotism, Instinctive and Intelligent," (1912); quoted here as reprinted in Maurice G. Fulton, ed., National Ideals and Problems (Freeport, New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1968), p.213.
- 11.) I want to call the reader's attention to Randolph Burne's essay "Trans-National America" in Bourne, War and the Intellectuals, ed. with introduction by Carl Resk (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1964), pp. 107-24. It is the only American writing on patriotism known to me that is not shamed by Lincoln's understanding of the matter.
- 12.) For a more sanguine account of the development of American patriotism than the one which follows, see Merle Curti, The Growth of American Thought, 3rd ed. (New York: Harper and Row, 1966), ch. 16.
- 13.) The seed of the following analysis comes from G.K. Chesterton's crotchety and brilliant essay in his What I Saw in America.

John Schaar is a professor of Political Science at the University of California, Santa Cruz. He is the author of Escape From Authority, Loyalty in America, and co-author of The Berkeley Rebellion and Beyond. This piece is excerpted from a longer article that first appeared in the New American Review.

This final essay "On Teaching Democratic Ideals" by Edward Schwartz, is the introduction to a study guide entitled, The Evolving Declaration. Here, practical suggestions are made as to how teachers might utilize the Declaration of Independence, supplemented by documents from American political history, to introduce students to the true content of democratic ideals.

On Teaching Democratic Ideals

by Edward Schwartz

Next month Change makes available to colleges and universities a special study guide on American ideals and human dignity. Here, its author explains its background. For details, see page 21.

A great many people are talking about the breakdown of public values today, but few have any ideas about how to combat it. For educational institutions, the problem is particularly acute. For years, universities prided themselves on being "value-free," encouraging scholarly research in a detached, objective fashion. Even during the 1960s, when students and others tried to point out that relativism was also a commitment, higher education tried to maintain a public posture of neutrality. Now the academy is called upon to help restore faith in a political process that it has scrupulously sought to avoid.

To be sure, the university periodically has risen to defend certain principles, but these have all revolved around the procedures essential to scholarship—free speech, due process, academic freedom. The crisis of values today extends beyond procedures to fundamental goals and directions. A sense of purpose has disappeared from our public life; and with its departure, the common understandings that make for civility in private life are vanishing as well. Millions of Americans have lost touch not only with where their country has been, but why it has been there. Such a situation calls for a restoration of authority and community, not merely liberty and due process. Since the universities have never handled the problems of authority and community terribly well, it is not surprising that they are ill-equipped to handle them today.

The preconditions for a response would seem to be these: first, acceptance of a common system of authority within which we can debate issues of value; second, development of a framework that allows us to link public principles with the private needs of the self—self-interest, so-called; and third, a strategy that helps Americans measure contemporary institutions in accordance with the public values that our society is supposed to share. All religions have adopted these principles of moral education in their efforts to win allegiance to their respective faiths—whether the au-

thority resides in the Bible or a pope; whether self-interest depends upon security from hell or purity on earth; whether the institutions promote justification by faith or justification by good works as well. The problem lies in discovering the appropriate counterparts for civic education, particularly for a civic education that establishes a framework of values without imposing a particular ideology in the process. A careful assessment of the American tradition suggests several possibilities for this country.

As a starting point, we ought to accept the Declaration of Independence as the central source of authority for national civic ideals, just as political scientists now recognize the Constitution and the *Federalist Papers* as the final word on American political institutions. G.K. Chesterton saw the critical importance of the Declaration to the country over 50 years ago. "America is the only country in the world that is founded on a creed," he observed in *What I Saw in America*. "That creed is set forth with dogmatic and theological lucidity in the Declaration of Independence." The "chief mark" of the Declaration, in turn, was "something which is not only absent from the British Constitution but something which all our constitutionalists have invariably thanked God, with the jolliest boasting and bragging, that they had kept out of the British Constitution. It is the thing called abstraction or academic logic. It is the thing which such jolly people call theory; and those who can practice it call thought—It is the theory of equality.... It enunciates that all men are equal in their claim to justice, and that their authority is for that reason just."

Past political leaders have had little difficulty in using the Declaration as a vehicle for political education of this sort. In 1848, Elizabeth Cady Stanton insisted that the right of women to vote was mandated "according to the declaration of the government under which we live." In 1896, William Jennings Bryan defended the cause of "the struggling masses, who produce the wealth and pay the taxes of the country," against the "idle holders of the idle capital" as the "issue of 1776 over again." More recently, the Rev. Martin Luther King pointed to the Declaration of Independence as a "promissory note to which every American was to fall heir," and "dreamed" that "one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creeds—we hold these truths to be self-evident that all

EDWARD SCHWARTZ is president of the Institute for the Study of Civic Values in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

men are created equal."

From this perspective, it is astonishing how little curricular material exists that uses the Declaration as an explicit frame of reference for civic education, and it is this lack which prompted *Change* to ask the Institute for the Study of Civic Values to prepare a simple study guide on the idea of American Ideals and Human Dignity. If debates over the Constitution define the issues that have arisen over the structure of government in our history, only the Declaration can help us understand the economic and social demands that have made structural change necessary. Alexis de Tocqueville, for example, recognized immediately the importance of equality to American values and politics. It was "a passion—ardent, insatiable, incessant, invincible; they call for equality in freedom; and if they cannot obtain that, they still call for equality in slavery." The ideal of equality begins with the Declaration of Independence. Thus, until social scientists find ways to explain the relationship between the Declaration and contemporary issues of justice, they will be overlooking the reason why such issues arise in the first place.

Even more serious than the failure of social scientists to discuss the Declaration of Independence in their classrooms is their tendency to formulate political problems in ways that ignore the connections between public principles and private interests. John Schaar, a professor of political science, has observed that modern criticism often posits "an incompatibility between things that we call individual freedom or authenticity or self-fulfillment and self-realization on the one side, and the structures and processes of power and of domination and of alienation and mediation on the other." The self can find no comfortable home at all in society within such a scheme—only in isolation, freed of external restraints. Authority no longer represents a prerequisite to freedom; it becomes instead freedom's irrevocable enemy.

Such an approach to life, though it may be imposed by the universities, is not natural to human beings. Everywhere we hear demands from citizens for dignity, for a sense of worth in the overall scheme of things. Economic inequality, social deprivation, and political corruption have aroused widespread cynicism and distrust because they suggest to people that the major institutions no longer care about them. People long for community as well—for physical reconstruction of small towns and urban neighborhoods, as well as for a revival of the social and religious values that have held distinctive national groupings together. Finally, they demand participation in the decisions that affect them—in the workplaces and the cities as well as in the universities and professional associations. Dignity, community, and participation have emerged as important principles for movements in the past 15 years. Significantly, they all assume a social dimension within which the private self must operate.

Dignity, community, and participation can become useful concepts for social science courses as well. A growing network of instructors within the New Jersey-eastern Pennsylvania region is beginning to adapt them to a variety of concerns. Thus, dignity is now used as an organizing principle in both an introductory humanities course taught at Allentown Community College and a course in contemporary labor problems offered by Rutgers, Pennsylvania State University, and the University of West Virginia through the Union Leadership Academy. A few urban studies classes at the University of Pennsylvania and Rutgers-Camden are now applying the idea of community to urban history and policy. Political theorists at Rutgers University will soon test a course on citizenship emphasizing classical and modern notions of participation, funded by a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities. These seminal ventures suggest new points of departure for social science teaching, hopeful signs for civic education in the future.

We must recognize, however, that dignity, community, and participation are merely useful conceptual tools for linking public and private concerns. They do not determine specific strategies for public policy and action. A citizen may achieve dignity through exploitation of others. A community can be organized for an unjust war. A political movement may demand participation in the process of oppression. Thus, while these values may represent important public goods, they do not represent the ultimate ideals of equality and justice that most Americans have come to identify with their civic heritage.

The imaginative opportunity for political education, then, is to compare the strategy for dignity, community, and participation suggested by the Declaration of Independence with the strategies adopted by institutions today. Can a worker, for example, achieve dignity as a citizen within the framework of the modern corporation? Can a neighborhood resident pursue life, liberty, and happiness in most American cities? Can a citizen participate effectively to make government respond to the ideals of the Declaration? The Institute for the Study of Civic Values has used questions like these in a variety of seminars and public discussions with workers and neighborhood residents in Philadelphia. Such forums have brought citizens together who have not been able to talk to one another in any other way—union members and welfare recipients; neighborhood leaders and city planners; whites and blacks. There is no reason why these preliminary successes cannot be duplicated in the classroom on a much broader scale.

To be sure, the university is not the only institution that must assume the responsibility for upholding America's civic values; all institutions share the burden to some extent. Thankfully, many institutions are

(Continued on page 64)

On Teaching
Democratic Ideals

(Continued from page 41)

coming to grips with the issues. Everywhere churches, unions, political parties, corporations are reexamining their relationship to American ideals and to the broad public that shares them. The recovery of political faith is high on the national agenda, even if most of us must struggle to find ways to achieve it.

The university does emerge as a logical leader in this process, however, for better or for worse. For all its imperfections, it remains the one institution in America where ideas are supposed to be taken seriously as ends in themselves, where Chesterton's notion of "theory" or "thought" is a legitimate enterprise. Shortly after his Presidency, Jefferson began to organize the University of Virginia, which he envisaged not merely as a community of scholars but as a center for creating active citizens and public leaders. At the end of his life, he saw this ideal as a vision second only to the Declaration itself. It is noted as such on his tombstone. Educators today may ask themselves whether the vision should remain there, resting in what must be an uneasy peace, or if the Bicentennial year should be the occasion to revive it. ■

pluralism

Randolph Bourne,
"Trans-National America."

Page 49.

Norman Jacobson,
"On Modernization in America."

Page 53.

PLURALISM

To melt, or not to melt, that is the question.

To date, much of the literature concerning the "new ethnicity" has revolved about this issue of assimilation versus cultural preservation. To be sure, the proponents of ethnicity usually seek to differentiate between a confident, tolerant sense of ethnicity, and a narrow, divisive provincialism. But in nearly all cases, "ethnicity" is offered as a preservative of the past, as an essentially rearguard effort. In his seminal essay, "What is an Ethnic", Andrew Greeley wrote:

To sum up, ethnic groups have emerged in this country because members of the various immigrant groups have tried to preserve something of the intimacy and familiarity of the peasant village during the transition into urban industrial living. These groups have persisted after the immigrant experience because American society was not basically hostile to their persistence and because of an apparently very powerful drive in man toward associating with those who, he believes, possess the same blood and same beliefs he does. (1.)

For certain, as a cultural ideal of diversity, ethnicity has much that is attractive about it, just as it has its dark underside. But as a political ideal that might unify disparate groups and inspire them toward common goals, it is sadly lacking in vitality. For it degenerates quite rapidly into each individual "doing their own cultural thing."

More than fifty years ago, on the verge of America's entering the First World War, Randolph Bourne offered a far more engaging vision in his essay, "Trans-National America." First, he began by rejecting the unappetizing stew served up by the "melting pot":

Just so surely as we tend to disintegrate these nuclei of nationalistic culture do we tend to create hordes of men and women without a spiritual country, cultural outlaws, without taste, without standards but those of the mob. We sentence them to live on the most rudimentary planes of American life. The influences at the centre of the nuclei are centripetal. They make for the intelligence and the social values which mean an enhancement of life. And just because the foreign-born retains this expressiveness is he likely to be a better citizen of the American community. The influences at the fringe, however, are centrifugal, anarchical. They make for detached fragments of peoples. Those who came to find liberty achieve only license. They become the

- 1.) Andrew Greeley, "What is An Ethnic" from Why Can't They Be Like Us?, (New York: Institute of Human Relations Press,) pp. 15-22.

flotsam and jetsam of American life, the downward undertow of our civilization with its leering cheapness and falseness of taste and spiritual outlook, the absence of mind and sincere feeling which we see in our slovenly towns, our vapid moving pictures, our popular novels, and in the vacuous faces of the crowds on the city street. This is the cultural wreckage of our time, and it is from the fringe of the Anglo-Saxon as well as the other stocks that it falls. America has as yet no impelling integrating force. It makes too easily for this detritus of cultures. In our loose, free country, no constraining national purpose, no tenacious folk-tradition and folk-style hold the people to a line....(2.)

He then went on to suggest a far more appealing and unifying vision of a "trans-national America":

The failure of the melting-pot, far from closing the great American democratic experiment, means that it has only just begun. Whatever American nationalism turns out to be, we see already that it will have a color richer and more exciting than our ideal has hitherto encompassed. In a world which has dreamed of internationalism, we find that we have all unawares been building up the first international nation. The voices which have cried for a tight and jealous nationalism of the European pattern are failing. From the ideal, however valiantly and disinterestedly it has been set for us, time and tendency have moved us further and further away. What we have achieved has been rather a cosmopolitan federation of national colonies, of foreign cultures, from whom the sting of devastating competition has been removed. America is already the world-federation in miniature, the continent where for the first time in history has been achieved that miracle of hope, the peaceful living side by side, with character substantially preserved, of the most heterogeneous peoples under the sun. Nowhere else has such contiguity been anything but the breeder of misery. Here, notwithstanding our tragic failures of adjustment, the outlines are already too clear not to give us a new vision and a new orientation of the American mind in the world.

It is for the American of the younger generation to accept this cosmopolitanism, and carry it along with self-conscious and fruitful purpose. In his colleges, he is already getting, with the study of modern history and politics, the modern literatures, economic geography, the privilege of a cosmopolitan outlook such as the people of no other nation of to-day in Europe can possibly secure...

...Indeed, it is not uncommon for the eager Anglo-Saxon who goes to a vivid American university to-day to find his true friends not among his own race but among the acclimatized German or Austrian, the acclimatized Jew, the acclimatized Scandinavian or Italian. In them he finds the cosmopolitan note. In these youths, foreign-born or the children of foreign-born parents, he is likely to find many of his old inbred morbid problems washed away. These friends are oblivious to the repressions of that tight little society in which he so provincially grew up. He has a pleasurable sense of liberation from the

- 2.) Randolph S. Bourne, War and the Intellectuals, (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1964,) p. 114.

stale and familiar attitudes of those whose ingrowing culture has scarcely created anything vital for his America of to-day. He breathes a larger air. In his new enthusiasms for continental literature, for unplumbed Russian depths, for French clarity of thought, for Teuton philosophies of power, he feels himself citizen of a larger world. He may be absurdly superficial, his outward-reaching wonder may ignore all the stiller and homelier virtues of his Anglo-Saxon home, but he has at least found the clue to that international mind which will be essential to all men and women of good-will if they are ever to save this Western world of ours from suicide. His new friends have gone through a similar evolution. America has burned most of the baser metal also from them. Meeting now with this common American background, all of them may yet retain that distinctiveness of their native cultures and their national spiritual slants. They are more valuable and interesting to each other for being different, yet that difference could not be creative were it not for this new cosmopolitan outlook which America has given them and which they all equally possess.

A college where such a spirit is possible even to the smallest degree, has within itself already the seeds of this international intellectual world of the future. It suggests that the contribution of America will be an intellectual internationalism which goes far beyond the mere exchange of scientific ideas and discoveries and the cold recording of facts. It will be an intellectual sympathy which is not satisfied until it has got at the heart of the different cultural expressions, and felt as they feel. It may have immense preferences, but it will make understanding and not indignation its end. Such a sympathy will unite and not divide.

Against the thinly disguised panic which calls itself 'patriotism' and the thinly disguised militarism which calls itself 'preparedness' the cosmopolitan ideal is set. This does not mean that those who hold it are for a policy of drift. They, too, long passionately for an integrated and disciplined America. But they do not want one which is integrated only for domestic economic exploitation of the workers or for predatory economic imperialism among the weaker peoples. They do not want one that is integrated by coercion or militarism, or for the truculent assertion of a mediaeval code of honor and of doubtful rights. They believe that the most effective integration will be one which coordinates the diverse elements and turns them consciously toward working out together the place of America in a the world-situation. They demand for integration a genuine integrity, a wholeness and soundness of enthusiasm and purpose which can only come when no national colony within our America feels that it is being discriminated against or that its cultural case is being prejudged. This strength of cooperation, this feeling that all who are here may have a hand in the destiny of America, will make for a finer spirit of integration than any narrow 'Americanism' or forced chauvinism.

In this effort we may have to accept some form of that dual citizenship which meets with so much articulate horror among us. Dual citizenship we may have to recognize as the rudimentary form of that international citizenship to which, if our words mean anything, we aspire.

We have assumed unquestioningly that mere participation in the political life of the United States must cut the new citizen off from all sympathy with his old allegiance. Anything but a bodily transfer of devotion from one sovereignty to another has been viewed as a sort of moral treason against the Republic. We have insisted that the immigrant whom we welcomed escaping from the very exclusive nationalism of his European home shall forthwith adopt a nationalism just as exclusive, just as narrow, and even less legitimate because it is founded on no warm traditions of his own. Yet a nation like France is said to permit a formal and legal dual citizenship even at the present time. Though a citizen of hers may pretend to cast off his allegiance in favor of some other sovereignty, he is still subject to her laws when he returns. Once a citizen, always a citizen, no matter how many new citizenships he may embrace. And such a dual citizenship seems sound and right. For it recognizes that, although the Frenchman may accept the formal institutional framework of his new country and indeed become intensely loyal to it, yet his Frenchness he will never lose. What makes up the fabric of his soul will always be of this Frenchness, so that unless he becomes utterly degenerate he will always to some degree dwell still in his native environment.

Indeed, does not the cultivated American who goes to Europe practice a dual citizenship, which, if not formal, is no less real? The American who lives abroad may be the least expatriate of men. If he falls in love with French ways and French thinking and French democracy and seeks to saturate himself with the new spirit, he is guilty of at least a dual spiritual citizenship. He may be still American, yet he feels himself through sympathy also a Frenchman. And he finds that this expansion involves no shameful conflict within him, no surrender of his native attitude. He has rather for the first time caught a glimpse of the cosmopolitan spirit. And after wandering about through many races and civilizations he may return to America to find them all here living vividly and crudely, seeking the same adjustment that he made. He sees the new peoples here with a new vision. They are no longer masses of aliens, waiting to be 'assimilated,' waiting to be melted down into the indistinguishable dough of Anglo-Saxonism. They are rather threads of living and potent cultures, blindly striving to weave themselves into a novel international nation, the first the world has seen. In an Austria-Hungary or a Prussia the stronger of these cultures would be moving almost instinctively to subjugate the weaker. But in America those wills-to-power are turned in a different direction into learning how to live together...

...Only America, by reason of the unique liberty of opportunity and traditional isolation for which she seems to stand, can lead in this cosmopolitan enterprise. Only the American--and in this category I include the migratory alien who has lived with us and caught the pioneer spirit and a sense of new social vistas--has the chance to become that citizen of the world. America is coming to be, not a nationality but a trans-nationality, a weaving back and forth, with the other lands, of many threads of all sizes and colors. Any movement which attempts to thwart this weaving, or to dye the fabric any one color, or disentangle the threads of the strands, is false to this cosmopolitan vision. I do not mean that we shall necessarily glut ourselves with the raw product of humanity. It would be folly to absorb the nations

faster than we could weave them. We have no duty either to admit or reject. It is purely a question of expediency. What concerns us is the fact that the strands are here. We must have a policy and an ideal for an actual situation. Our question is, What shall we do with our America? How are we likely to get more creative America--by confining our imaginations to the ideal of the melting-pot, or broadening them to some such cosmopolitan conception as I have been vaguely sketching?

...All our idealisms must be those of future social goal in which all can participate, the good life of personality lived in the environment of the Beloved Community. No mere doubtful triumphs of the past, which redound to the glory of only one of our trans-nationalities, can satisfy us. It must be a future America, on which all can unite, which pulls us irresistibly toward it, as we understand each other more warmly.

To make real this striving amid dangers and apathies is work for a younger intelligentsia of America. Here is an enterprise of integration into which we can all pour ourselves, of a spiritual welding which should make us, if the final menace ever came, not weaker, but infinitely strong. (3.)

Finally, if one seeks to teach "ethnic history", the following Bicentennial Address by Norman Jacobson reminds us that in the unexpurgated version of American history, the price of assimilation and modernization must always be counted.

ON "MODERNIZATION" IN AMERICA: A NEW WORLD PASSIONAL
Norman Jacobson
Bicentennial Address, Reed College, April 29, 1976

On the tenth day of May, one hundred years ago, President Ulysses Grant declared an official opening of the International Exhibition at Philadelphia in honor of the American Centennial. In addition to a cluster of imposing structures erected with the aid of a special Centennial Fund, an array of buildings, another one hundred and eighty, had been put up by the State of Pennsylvania, by foreign governments, or by American corporations and entrepreneurs, all within the space of twelve months preceding the celebration. Over 110,000 persons, at 50 cents a head, were spectators at the opening ceremonies. Agents of the resplendent monarchies of Europe, in some cases the monarchs themselves, listened to a stirring "Centennial Inauguration March" composed for the occasion by Richard Wagner. And when the President had finished his address, flags and ensigns of all the civilized countries of earth were unfurled,

2.) Ibid., pp. 117-123.

Norman Jacobson is a Professor of Political Science at the University of California at Berkeley

there began a massive ringing of chimes, the salute of a hundred guns boomed out from atop George's Hill, and Handel's magnificent Hallelujah Chorus soared into the air propelled by a thousand voices accompanied by a symphony orchestra and giant pipe organ. Hundreds of colorfully uniformed calvary served as escorts to the dignitaries, cheers were everywhere to be heard, and the Americans' own "Crystal Palace" proclaimed to the world the entrance upon the stage of a young nation capable of competing favorably with the manufactures of the oldest nations of Europe.

Make no mistake, that was precisely the intent of the celebration, to give proof of America's having arrived, in scarcely one hundred years, as a great industrial power. There was another, domestic, reason for the decision to present America in this light at the Centennial. Joseph Hawley, president of the Centennial Commission, remarked that it was "the fervent hope of the Commission that, during this festival year, the people from all States and sections, of all creeds and churches, all parties and classes, burying all resentments, would come up together to the birthplace of our liberties, to study the evidence of our resources; to measure the progress of an hundred years...." If the Declaration of Independence were not equal to the task of binding up the wounds of the past decade, then contemplation of the wonders of American industry might just do the trick. After all, America land of the free was a familiar enough theme for the Fourth of July. America land of industrial progress was being celebrated on a grand scale for the first time.(1.)

True, some fifty years earlier, during the return of the Marquis de La Fayette to tour the land upon which his glory had been won, many of the sentiments expressed then partook of a similar spirit. The old bones of the French aristocrat were trundled from mill to factory to thriving commercial centers throughout the busy country. "There," the sons and grandsons of the patriots seemed to say, "look at what we have made with the freedom you helped us grasp, see what marvels have been wrought by the cleverness of our hands and the constancy of our labor, are you not proud of us, have not our works redeemed the pledge General Washington made to you in those heroic days?" Before he was permitted to go in peace, LaFayette was granted the sum of 200,000 dollars and a township of land by a grateful Congress. America, but a youth, and a democratic one at that, boasted such abundance she could recognize a debt to an Old-World aristocrat in so liberal a fashion. America had been on the move even then. But all that was as nothing compared with the enormous strides of the past half century, as the celebrants at Philadelphia were quick to acknowledge. After all, in 1826 the total manufactures of the United States had amounted to a paltry few hundred millions of dollars. Fifty years later, the figure had risen to some five billion.

The Centennial program began with a prayer offered up by the Reverend Bishop Matthew Simpson of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Mr. Simpson thanked the good Lord "for the land which Thou gavest to our fathers, a land veiled from the ages, from the ancient world, but revealed in the fullness of time to Thy chosen people, whom Thou didst lead by Thine own right hand through the billows of the deep, a land of vast extent, of towering mountains and broad plains, of unnumbered products and of untold treasure." "Thou wast their shield in hours of danger, their pillar of cloud by day, and their pillar of fire by night." Who could doubt that America was indeed the Promised Land, her people the Chosen ones? But even bounteous nature and diligent people are, by themselves, not enough.

What was present on the American continent, in the very air her industrious citizens breathed, was the spirit of progress never ending. The prayer of the Reverend Mr. Simpson continued: "We thank Thee for social and national prosperity and progress, for valuable discoveries and multiplied inventions, for labor-saving machinery, relieving the toiling masses...." The prayers of Americans at the Centennial were directed to the "King of Kings and Lord of Lords" who had granted an illustrious son of the Revolution the inspiration "to draw experimentally the electric spark from heaven, which has since girdled the globe..." Not, at this occasion, the God who had inspired Benjamin Franklin as the author of the Declaration of Independence, but the God of Material Progress.

When the spectators later crowded in to the vastness of Machinery Hall, where a slumbering giant, the massive Corliss steam engine was held captive, the word seemed to have been made, if not flesh, then at least steel. Nothing like it had ever been witnessed on the face of the earth. There the monster stood, almost 40 feet high, with its 27 foot walking beam limbs. And when, at the joint touch of the President and His Majesty Dom Pedro, Emperor of Brazil, the 30 foot flywheel began to turn, the throng experienced an almost religious ecstasy. William Dean Howells described the machine to his Atlantic magazine readers as possessing a "vast and almost silent grandeur. It rises loftily in the center of the huge structure, an athlete of steel and iron with not a superfluous ounce of metal on it; the mighty walking beams plunge their pistons downward, the enormous fly-wheel revolves with a hoarded power that makes all tremble...All that Great Britain and Germany have sent is insignificant in amount when compared with our own contributions...Yes, it is still in these things of iron and steel that the national genius most freely speaks...."

Industry, prosperity, discovery, progress, the dream realized. Yet there were those ominous "toiling masses" scarce mentioned in the invocation. Howells remarked that only a single workman was required to command and service the Corliss giant. "In the midst of this ineffably strong mechanism," he wrote, "is a chair where the engineer sits reading his newspaper, as in a peaceful bower. Now and then he lays down his paper and clambers up one of the stairways...and touches some irritated spot on the giant's body with a drop of oil, and goes down again and takes up his newspaper."

(2.) Dr. Frankenstein and his monster, a true marvel. But how many flesh and blood people had been sacrificed, in forge and at work bench, to the construction of the monster itself? And where had they come from during the half century between the tour of La Fayette and the dawn of the new industrial era? Many had been drawn to the New World from the old. In those fifty years almost nine million immigrants had come to America from Europe alone, a remarkable figure considering that in 1876 the entire population of the United States was only forty million. In that year over 80 per cent of the residents of the greatest industrial centers of the land--New York, Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, and Milwaukee--were either immigrants themselves, or the sons and daughters of immigrants. (3.) The largest part of them were peasants and artisans from Northern, Western and Central Europe, to be shaped in the Nineteenth Century into a disciplined industrial work force. And the movement, from the standpoint of numbers alone, had scarcely begun.

In a Cantata composed for the celebration, Sidney Lanier, a Georgia poet of note, recreates the saga of man against sea and man against land which had culminated in the greatness of America.

Winter cries, Ye freeze: away!
 Fever cries, Ye burn: away!
 Hunger cries, Ye starve: away!
 Vengeance cries, Your graves shall stay!...

Error, Terror, Rage, and Crime,
 All in a windy night of time
 Cried to me from land and sea,
No! Thou shalt not be!...

Now Praise to God's oft-granted grace,
 Now Praise to Man's undaunted face,
 Despite the land, despite the sea,
 I was: I am: and I shall be.

Lanier's poem begins, appropriately enough, with an image of the Mayflower lurching through heavy seas, her decks athrob with the trembling hearts of her human cargo, then moves on to look in at Plymouth, at Jamestown, and at Albany. Everywhere and, in my judgment, throughout American history as well, the struggle for survival is repeated with almost stupifying regularity.

Here the account of the Mayflower party from a leading member, Governor William Bradford. The passengers who tumbled, exhausted and relieved, from the Mayflower in November, 1620, fell upon their knees, blessed God for having delivered them from the terrors of the sea, then looked about them. What they saw, and how they reacted to the scene before them, have been preserved in Bradford's records.

They had no friends to welcome them, nor inns to entertain or refresh their weatherbeaten bodies, nor houses or much less towns to repair to, to seek for succour... And for the season it was winter...sharp and violent, and subject to cruel and fierce storms, dangerous to travel to known places, much more to search an unknown coast. Besides, what could they see but a hideous and desolate wilderness...?...(And) which way soever they turned their eyes (save upward to the heavens) they could have little solace or content...The whole country...represented a wild and savage hue. If they looked behind them, there was the mighty ocean which they had passed, and was now as a main barrier and gulf to separate them from all the civil parts of the world.

A breathtaking scene, one of primal horror at abandonment, cut off those stubborn souls were from all the civil parts of the world. Half the party perished that first winter.

But even in 1876, Lanier fails to mention the later arrivals in America, the ones called not settlers or colonists but immigrants, setting them off from the rest. Circumstances had not changed all that much for them a century after the Plymouth landing. Engraved on the tombstone of one Reverend John Starman at rest in the German cemetery at Waldoboro, Maine, are these mournful words:

This town was settled in 1748 by Germans who emigrated to this place with the promise and expectation of finding a prosperous city, instead of which they found nothing but wilderness.

"Man," Adam Smith once remarked, "is, of all luggage, the most difficult to be transported." And, he might have added, with the most damage upon arrival. The miseries of the slave trade are often remarked, while those of willing immigrants, particularly during the Nineteenth Century, are noticed less frequently. Masters whose ships carried lumber to Great Britain from Boston and Quebec had in the 1820's discovered to their profit a remarkable new commodity--ambulatory ballast with which to fill their empty holds on the voyage home. What's more, not only did the human ballast distribute themselves sensibly about the hold, they were even willing to pay a few shillings for the privilege. Among those exploited and neglected souls the misery was appalling. During the spring of the famine year 1847, 89,738 Irish men, women and children set out for the port cities of Canada, there to travel overland principally to Boston. Of these, 6,116 died of epidemic on the crossing, a mortality rate of some six per cent. But that was only the beginning. Another 11,329 died aboard ships in quarantine or in hospital cots and tents. Just under 90,000 Irish had fled poverty, famine and disease; over 17,000 of them left their bones at the bottom of the sea or upon the shores of the New World. The total mortality was roughly sixteen per cent, a figure which the most authoritative historian of the Atlantic migration terms "conservative." (4.) And yet they came, from Ireland and England, from Germany and the Scandinavian countries, later on from Eastern, Central and Southern Europe; some 35 to 40 millions of immigrants, among whom the estimates sent the mortality rate for the crossing alone at anywhere from one-half to one and one-half per cent. And that does not include those who perished on the long journey from the homeland countryside to the port city. Nor the one-third who died within their first three years in America, a haunting figure which holds for the era of the sailing vessel. (5.)

Even in our own century the physical losses have been heavy, this time not at sea but at the workbenches, construction jobs, assembly lines, and in the mines and mills and smelters. Almost a quarter of the recent arrivals from Eastern Europe who made up the labor force at the Carnegie South Works in Pittsburgh were killed or seriously injured each and every year between 1907 and 1910, (6.) a casualty rate to challenge that suffered by a front line company in the war which was then but a few years off. We frequently remark the pains of acculturation, which I intend to do a bit later on, but a good part of the poor humanity at the Carnegie works never had a chance even to learn the language. Still, the migration went on.

The first great mass migration recorded by history which constituted at the same time a symbolic "mass movement" was that of the Hebrews led by Moses, a tale awful with human suffering. The sacrifice of an entire generation was required in order to turn a slave rabble into a nation of free men, and I have been unable to discover in subsequent history any significant departure from the pattern established in Palestine millenia ago. In our own time, whether the aim has been "Socialist Revolution" or "Industrialization" or "Modernization," the verdict has been similar in Russia, in China, and in many parts of the contemporary "Third World." There is some human material deemed so intractable, so unmalleable, as to render profound change impossible. The bearers of the ideas and customs of an older order must be cut down--now--if their children are to taste the fruits of modern learning, industry, and organization in the future.

What of Europe during the Nineteenth Century, did not the great nations of Europe escape that chilling specter? Not if one were to read the pages of Dickens, of Balzac or of Zola, or the melancholy statistics of Karl Marx. No question, without the opportunity seized upon by European industrialists, to accumulate capital from overseas empires, the misery of the European workingman would certainly have been greater. His misery would have been far greater still had Europe refrained from exporting her problems. She engaged in the ingenious practice of exploiting foreign workers and markets, while ridding herself of superfluous populations, peasants operating sub-marginal parcels of land in particular. Only the United States has escaped the imposition of the pattern. That has been the verdict of American scholarship, glorying in American exceptionalism. We are told that we have broken out of the tradition, American has industrialized without that appalling human cost. It is simply a matter of accounting for this happy circumstance. Some American historians and social scientists credit the fortuitous existence of the frontier, others prefer the abundance of natural resources across the continent, yet others a combination of democracy and capitalist enterprise. The truth is obvious, only the factors required to explain it need engage us.

I have already implied, in the mortality figures I set forth, that such a proposition is utterly absurd. The dues were paid in full, and not only by those who perished in the Nineteenth Century, whether on the voyage from Europe or Africa, or within a short time of their arrival in the New World. We have heard a great deal recently about the sins of the fathers. It would seem that a blend of Puritanism and Freudian psychology has struck deep root among us. What I am interested in here, however, are less the sins than the sacrifices of the fathers, which have taken a far greater psychic toll. Not of the Fathers, the men who made a rebellion and later pounded out an agreement of government. But of those anonymous men and women who turned themselves into a disciplined industrial work force, in order that if they themselves could not, then at least their children would dwell in the Promised Land. My point is not only that so many immigrants lived for the future, represented in their children and grandchildren, but that they chose to do so. No Moses to strike inspiration and terror into their hearts, no Lenin or Stalin, no Mao, with their stern cadres. Millions of souls choosing--of their own will, however desperate---to "modernize" themselves. By their leaving home they chose, and that fact overwhelmed the other fact of the matter, that once on these shores, there was no longer an alternative to changing their way of life. The world has never witnessed such a spectacle, and on so grand a scale. Human beings operating upon themselves, making themselves over, in order to be superseded by their progeny. Modernization has been a central fact of life in America, it has also been the central American ideology; the manner in which it was accomplished has done damage to the American soul.

Each generation of immigrants wandered through a wasteland of its own, comparable, again in its own way, to that of the Puritans and the Hebrews before them, in search of a Promised Land worthy of sacrifice. Such a land was discovered again and again not in the present, whose reality was the wasteland of some ghetto, but in a future that would be generous to the children. Modernization becomes the secular religion of America, the most pervasive and deeply felt ideology in the New World. Go thou, and modernize. Change your language, change your diet, your family customs, change your work habits, and if not from the British Isles first

of all change your unpronounceable name, badge of slavery. Go thou, and modernize. The wealthier peasants who had enough money to buy land in the upper Mississippi Valley only managed to postpone the inevitable for half a century or so. Constant change, continuous movement, the roar of millions of internal engines spread across a continent and in our own century burst upon the world. Go thou, and modernize. The successive waves of immigration which constituted a migration without parallel in magnitude, were for the most part leaderless, and involved a minimum of planning by the host country. Leaderlessness, movement, individual determination in the absence of planning born of a combination of optimism, busyness and what must have appeared inexhaustible space, these draw near to the heart of the American mystery.

In the name of becoming an American and gaining a share in her future for one's children, the newcomer first gives himself over to the project of changing himself. Oh, there will be a great deal of mourning and gnashing of teeth over the loss of the delights and solaces of the old life, but change is inevitable. Many an immigrant who believed himself immune to the pressures of Americanization was shocked upon returning to visit the old village by the unworldliness and squalor which were present there. By the next generation the imperative will have been internalized. The creation of a disciplined work force in America was not the product of legislation, but of choice. True, the propaganda mills of the railroads and great industries were busy grinding out enticing fare to lure the immigrant to America, while the desperation of his circumstances in the old country served to push him out. Still, a choice was made somewhere along the line.

I emphasize this idea, first because it is literally fanatastic. Why in the world would anyone wish to pound and whittle himself into a member of a modern work force driven remorselessly by the clock, particularly former peasants and artisans, for whom the exercise must have seemed unnatural? The records are everywhere plain that before coming to the factory, the mill, and the modern mine, that is, before the Industrial Revolution, men in control of their own labor alternated between intense industry and delicious idleness. For the peasant, the periodicity of nature set the pattern. To create a disciplined work force required first of all that these unpredictable creatures be disciplined. In his monumental study of the shaping of the English working class, E.P. Thompson states that the "deep-rooted folk memory of a 'golden age' or of 'Merrie England' derives not from the notion that material goods were more plentiful in 1780 than in 1840 but from nostalgia for the pattern of work and leisure which obtained before the outer and inner disciplines of industrialism settled upon the working man." He writes that the factory system demanded "a transformation of human nature," in which the "working paroxysms" of the ordinary Englishman "must be methodized until the man is adapted to the discipline of the machine." (7.)

In England discipline was laid on, quite deliberately, by industrialist and theologian alike. The lessons taught were brutal, the teachers clear-eyed in their pedagogy. A leading English divine, Dr. Andrew Ure, published in 1835 a work titled Philosophy in Manufacture, in which he defined a factory as "a vast automaton, composed of various mechanical and intellectual organs, acting in uninterrupted concert for the production of a common object, all of them being subordinated to a self-regulated moving force." But how to transform human beings into adjuncts of machines,

that was the question. Ure's answer was to train them "to renounce their desultory habits of work, and to identify themselves with the unvarying regularity" of the factory. The desire for monetary gain was, by itself, not equal to the task. No, the populous had to be trained. "It is," Ure wrote, "excessively the interest of every mill-owner to organize his moral machinery on equally sound principles with his mechanical, for otherwise he will never command the steady hands, watchful eyes, and prompt co-operation, essential to excellence of product." Urged on by a wage sufficient to push him into the factory and reproduce his kind, and whipped into submission by his clergyman and overser, the Englishman became enslaved to the machine. Thompson remarks that "Work was the Cross from which the 'transformed' industrial worker hung."

I mention the English experience only to provide contrast. The industrial worker there had to be forged, he was the product of a deliberate campaign to break his spirit and command his labor, much the way an animal is broken. Lucky man. Even today the English working class is capable of irreverence, sometimes even sullenness. It knows its oppressor, the tyrant has a name. What has forced upon the Englishman was embraced by the new American. He chose slavery for himself, that his children should survive and become free. Even the solitary recruits to the labor force who worked against the day when they might return to their families in their own homelands, became hostages to the future. To this day we, their descendants, suffer our own tyranny over ourselves.

Take the case of the peasant who transforms himself into an industrial worker or a member of a road or construction gang, or a section hand for some railroad. Peasants live a timeless existence. The future for them is the present is the past. Son succeeds father and is succeeded in turn. The process is not aimed at going anywhere, one lives to the full, if one can. In such circumstances, there exists no place for the dream of a wondrous future, at least on earth. But once the cycle is ruptured, once the peasant enters the modern labor force, he indentures himself to the future and a tacit bargain is struck with his generations to come. Or shall all this sweat, this discipline, this weariness and despair have been borne in vain? That is why, granting all compusions, the idea of choice is so crucial. Were the industrial work force and its adjuncts the product of an American despot, or could the worker believe himself the victim of industrial capitalists, whose status he hopes his children might one day achieve, he might suffer more in the ranks, physically, authority might appear implacable, an act of nature almost, yet there could be no imputation of personal responsibility stemming from the original choice, as well as the guilt and rage of his progeny should they fail to measure up. Several recent investigations into the attitudes towards their work and toward themselves among blue collar workers, particularly "ethnics," come to the melancholy conclusion that the individual takes the onus for failure upon himself alone. By "failure" is meant lack of advancement up the enchanted ladder leading to "success." The wicked thought sometimes occurs to me that America is one vast laboratory experiment in the turning of the screw, drawing its specimens from the four corners of the earth, and conducted by a team of determined behavioral psychologists. Only we ourselves appear to be psychologist as well as victim.

Let us look closely at a single life commented upon by the person himself. In a powerful memoir written a half-dozen years ago, called "Choosing a Dream: Italians in Hell's Kitchen," (8.) Mario Puzo, author of The Godfather, looks back at his childhood spent "in the heart of New York's Neapolitan ghetto." Both his parents, as their ancestors for generations be-

fore them, had been born on rocky hill farms near Naples. When his mother learned that her family could afford no dowry for her, the humiliation led to her leaving for America to marry a man she scarcely knew, who later died in a work accident on the New York docks. She then married Puzo, a laborer for the New York Central Railroad whose freight yards were beneath the windows of the tenement in which they lived. Mario Puzo writes that he "never heard any Italian singing. None of the grown-ups I knew were charming or loving or understanding... And so later in my life when I was exposed to all the cliches of lovable Italians, singing Italians, happy-go-lucky Italians, I wondered where the hell the moviemakers and storywriters got all their ideas from." All the adults he knew "were a grim lot; always shouting, always angry, quicker to quarrel than embrace." He says that he was too young to understand then "that their lives were a long labor to earn their daily bread and that physical fatigue does not sweeten human nature."

As for the vaunted culture of Italy, Puzo writes that his mother (the father having deserted the family after the third child), direct descendent of a thousand years of illiterates, had never heard of Michelangelo; "the great deeds of the Caesars had not yet reached her ears." Nor had the "great music of her native land." As a boy Puzo knew that he would make his escape, that, in his words, he "was one of the chosen. I would be rich," he recalls, "famous, happy. I would master my destiny." And so, "like all the children in the ghettos of America," he "became locked in a bitter struggle with the adults responsible for (him)." He would escape and become a writer. His mother's son, a writer? "To this day," he says, "she shakes her head. I shake mine with her." Puzo writes of America, "what a miracle it once was! What has happened here has never happened in any other country in any other time. The poor who had been poor for centuries--hell, since the beginning of Christ--whose children had inherited their poverty, their illiteracy, their hopelessness, achieved some economic dignity and freedom." Then that inevitable refrain, "You didn't get it for nothing, you had to pay a price in tears, and suffering..." Puzo adds defiantly "but why not?" That is the very question we have been addressing. Let Mario Puzo himself answer it for us.

Puzo concedes that, "of course," he "had never really escaped, not my mother, not my family, not the moral pressures of our society...In the next twenty years I wrote three novels. Two of them were critical successes but I didn't make much money. The third novel, not as good as the others, made me rich. And free at last. Or so I thought." Then why, he asks, "do I dream of those immigrant Italian peasants as having been happy?" "No, really," he says, "we are all happier now. It is a better life." Which is immediately qualified by the next sentence: "And after all, as my mother always said, 'Never mind about being happy. Be glad you're alive.'" A philosopher of survival.

When he was writing his best book, his autobiographical novel The Fortunate Pilgrim (what an evocative title!), Puzo tells us that he "planned to make (himself) the sensitive, misunderstood hero, much put upon by his mother and family. "To my astonishment," he writes, "my mother took over the book and instead of my revenge I got another comeuppance...And all those old-style grim conservative Italians whom I hated, then pitied so

patronizingly, they also turned out to be heroes. Through no desire of mine. I was surprised. The thing that amazed me most was their courage. Where were their Congressional Medals of Honor? Their Distinguished Service Crosses?...Heroes. Heroes all around me. I never saw them." In his youth Puzo had "found them contemptible. And yet," he says with pride and wonder, "they had left Italy and sailed the ocean to come to a new land and leave their sweated bones in America. Illiterate Colombos, they dared to seek the promised land. And so they, too, dreamed a dream."

There it is, the pattern from the time of the Mayflower, Puzo had first sought revenge upon the past, he felt far superior to the lot of those ignorant peasants. Then, to his astonishment, they were transformed into heroes in the theater of his imagination. He prostrates himself before them in reverence, and confesses that he will never measure up, never be worthy of so awesome a sacrifice.

But the harsh fact remains, he is still imprisoned in the past. The cycle of poverty and illiteracy and hopelessness which had wracked generations of Italian peasants might have at last been broken. The American cycle of enslavement to the future which traps later generations in enslavement to the past is still intact.

This is plain to see in the words with which Mario Puzo chooses to conclude his memoir. Candid and rueful words they are: "I am another Italian success story. Not as great as DiMaggio or Sinatra but quite enough. It will serve. Yet I can escape again." But why on earth would Puzo, or any other red-blooded American, for that matter, wish to escape Success, wish to escape through what the writer calls his great capacity for "retrospective falsification" fame and fortune and the adulation of his countrymen? Because it has, in his view, not really been worth the candle. "I can dream now," he writes, "how happy I was in my childhood, in my tenement, playing in all those dirty but magical streets--living in the poverty that made my mother weep...And now I remember, all those impossible dreams strung out before me, waiting for me to choose, not knowing that the life I was living then, as a child, would become my final dream."

A bitter irony. To look back is all too often to do so in anger or with guilt. In the first instance, we fix our gaze upon the venality or the social irresponsibility or the ignorance or vulgarity of past generations; in the second, upon our own inadequacies, especially when viewed in the pitiless light of the sacrifices continuously made in order that we be given the chance to make something of ourselves. In becoming hostages to the future our forebears, whether or not they intended it, made us hostages to the past. How to break out of the cycle of the generations in a land so newly settled that no trace of sacrifice is easy to lose from sight, how may one acknowledge the past, perhaps even learn from it, without becoming its prisoner? I am able to think of only a single way: a respectful acceptance of the long trail of lives broken upon the harsh realities entailed in subduing this continent, accompanied by a letting go of the dangerous fantasy that we have it in our power to redeem past suffering, the stuff that guilt is forever being made of. Let the dead bury their dead, we cannot redeem the suffering of the fathers. We have, it would seem, accepted that losing proposition in America from the time the second generation of Puritans beat their breasts and lamented the passing of the extraordinary virtue of the first generation. Whence the guilt or the righteous rage towards those who have preceded us. We need not, like the Puritans, whip ourselves into virtuous demons, nor, like the children of more recent immigrants, feel driven to justify the sacri-

fices of the fathers by becoming models of achievement and success, survivors who have yet lived too little. Nor need we turn upon them and heap curses upon their heads. At the Bicentennial maybe we can simply acknowledge the suffering of our forebears, respect their lives and their choices, as an act of piety. Then perhaps we will be able to walk into the future with a lighter step.

FOOTNOTES

1. All materials dealing with the Centennial celebration come from International Exhibition, 1876, U.S. Centennial Commission, Reports of the President, Secretary, and Executive Committee, together with the Journal of the Final Session of the Commission, II (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1880), pp. 27-37.
2. William Dean Howells, "A Sennight of the Centennial," Atlantic, XXXVIII (July, 1876), in Henry Nash Smith, Popular Culture & Industrialism, 1865-1890 (N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1967), p. 72.
3. Herbert G. Gutman, "Work, Culture, and Society in Industrializing America, 1815-1919," The American Historical Review, 78, No. 3 (June, 1973), p. 561.
4. Marcus Lee Hansen, The Atlantic Migration 1607-1860 (N.Y.: Harper Torchbooks, 1961), pp. 256-257.
5. Hansen, The Immigrant in American History (N.Y.: Harper Torchbooks, 1964), p. 52.
6. Gutman, p. 553.
7. All quotations from Thompson, including the words of Dr. Andrew Ure, are from E. P. Thompson, The Making of the English Working Class (N.Y.: Vintage, 1966), pp. 350-369.
8. Puzo, in T. C. Wheeler, The Immigrant Experience: The Anguish of Becoming American (N.Y.: Dial, 1971), pp. 35-49.

participation

Jean-Jacques Rousseau,
"Deputies or Representatives." Page 65.

Donald Robinson,
"Democracy is Not for Children." Page 67.

Judith Gillespie and Stuart Lazarus,
"Teaching Political Participation
Skills." Page 69.

Participation

Should the schools promote political participation? The first reading from The Social Contract by Jean-Jacque Rousseau makes the argument that direct participation by every member of the polity is the essence of democratic government. In this expression of the ideal, the term "citizen" is reserved only for those who actively engage in political life. Thus, by this logic, anyone who takes the name "citizen educator" seriously must accept the responsibility for teaching participation.

For educators associated with activist and lobbying groups participation is clearly a central institutional goal. But what can the schools realistically do? The second essay included here, Donald Robinson's "Democracy is not for Children", is an important warning as to what the schools should not do. Robinson points out that much that goes on within the classroom cannot, by definition, be democratic. A class, he reminds us, does not determine the location of Alaska by majority rule. It is a dangerous error, he notes, for a teacher to tell students that they are participating democratically when something quite different is really the case.

The third selection, "Teaching Political Participation Skills" by Judith Gillespie and Stuart Lazarus is an example of both what can be done and how to do it. Gillespie and Lazarus first make the case for teaching participation skills and then offer a sample lesson drawn from their "Comparing Political Experience" curriculum.

The first selection is then one of the clearest statements of the ideal of participatory democracy.

"Deputies or Representatives"

Jean-Jacques Rousseau*

The better the state is constituted, the more public affairs take precedence over private business in the minds of the citizens. There is, in fact, much less private business, because the sum of public happiness, so that he has less portion of each individual's happiness, so that he has less of it to seek by private means. In a well-governed republic, everyone hurries to assemblies: under a bad government, no one likes to take a step to go to them, because no one has any interest in what takes place in them, because everyone assumes that the general will has no chance of prevailing in them, and finally, because everyone is completely absorbed in his own domestic concerns. Good laws cause better ones to be made; bad laws bring on worse ones. A state must be considered lost as soon as someone says, with regard to its affairs, "What does it matter to me?"

The decline of love of one's country, the vigorous pursuit of private interest, the vastness of states, conquests, and the abuse of government have led to the invention of sending deputies or representatives of the people to the assemblies of the nation. Some countries dare to call them the representatives of the "third estate," thus giving first and second priority to the private interests of two classes, with the public interest only in third place.

Sovereignty cannot be represented, for the same reason that it cannot be alienated. Its essence is the general will, and a will cannot be represented: It is either itself or not itself; there is no middle ground. The deputies of the people therefore are not and cannot be its representatives; they are only its agents and cannot decide anything definitively. Any law that the people has not ratified in person is invalid; it is not a law. The English believe themselves to be free; they are seriously mistaken, for they are free only during elections of members of Parliament, and in the time between those elections the people is in slavery, it is nothing. In the brief moments of their freedom, the English use it in such a way that they deserve to lose it.

The idea of representatives is modern: It comes to us from feudal government that iniquitous and absurd government in which the human race is degraded and the name of man is dishonored. In the republics and even the monarchies of antiquity, the people never had representatives; the word was unknown...

In Greece, everything the people had to do it did for itself; it was constantly assembled outdoors. The Greeks lived in a mild climate, they were not avaricious, their work was done for them by slaves, and freedom was their primary concern. Without the same advantages, how can the same rights be preserved? Our harsher

*This piece excerpted from Book III, Chapter 15 of The Social Contract.

climates increase our needs, our outdoor public places are unusable six months of the year, our muted languages cannot be understood in the open air, we devote more effort to gain than to freedom, and we fear slavery less than poverty.

What! Freedom can be maintained only with the support of slavery? Perhaps. The two extremes meet. Everything that is not in nature has its disadvantages, civil society more than all the rest. There are unfortunate situations in which one man can preserve his freedom only at the expense of another's, in which the citizen can be perfectly free only if the slave is in extreme servitude. Such was the situation of Sparta. As for you, modern peoples, you have no slaves, but you yourselves are enslaved; you pay for their freedom with your own. You may boast of your preference, but I see more baseness than humanity in it.

I do not mean by all this that slavery is necessary, or that the right of enslavement is legitimate, for I have proved the contrary. I am only stating the reasons why modern peoples, who consider themselves free, have representatives, and why ancient peoples had none. In any case, as soon as a people gives itself representatives, it is no longer free; it no longer exists.

All things considered, I do not see how the sovereign can continue to exercise its rights in our modern world, except in very small republics...

Too often students acquire the bad habits of apathy and cynicism about democracy from the very people who should be teaching them better. In the following essay Donald Robinson points to the limits of the "democratic classroom."

Reprinted from Robinson,
Donald, "Democracy is Not
for Children", Phi Delta
Kappan, May 1961, pp. 361-
62

Democracy Is Not for Children

How do children acquire a reasonably accurate
concept of democracy if not by practicing it?

Here a teacher traces the pitfalls of
"democracy" in the classroom.

By DONALD W. ROBINSON

WHAT is the proper place of democracy in the classroom? If it is partly true that democracy is not for children, surely it is equally true that children must learn democracy. While some schools have succeeded with democratic education, others have succeeded in fostering arrogant selfishness and inconsiderateness in the name of democratic rights.

Several misconceptions threaten the efforts of some of our schools to inculcate democratic concepts, and worse, they sometimes lead to monstrous perversions of the democratic ideal.

The first error is the assumption that democracy can be established in the classroom. The first principle of democracy is the selection of leaders by the members of the group. Obviously, the leader in the classroom is imposed upon children who can have no voice in the selection.

Student officers can, of course, be elected. And they can operate under the watchful eye of a benign dictator. But the ultimate authority is an arbitrary adult authority who does not represent the students' genuine desires. The experience of going through the motions of self-government under the surveillance of a teacher who is responsible for the all-important report card grades is not designed to develop independent thinking and acting in the embryonic citizen, no matter how friendly and permissive the teacher may be. While this experience may develop all kinds of civic virtues, it should not be called democracy unless the teacher really abdicates her authority and the students assume full responsibility for their decisions.

A second distortion of the democratic concept results from inevitable simplifications of a complex political theory. Effective democracy requires the cooperative action of mature, independent, intelli-

gent people who know how to make judgments, to compromise, and to participate in the execution of a policy even while they work for its change. This requires a kind of adulthood that many people never achieve and that almost none can achieve during childhood or adolescence. The very difficulty of self-government that demands an early practice to perfect it should at the same time alert us to the dangers of calling the children's preliminary efforts by the same name as the adult practice.

When a child learns to add figures we do not call him a mathematician. When he learns a few dates and facts of history we do not let him think he is a historian. Why should we allow him to think that conducting a class vote under the supervision of the teacher is democracy? It is a lesson in democracy, nothing more. Great damage results from allowing students year after year to associate the word democracy with an experience which is considerably less than democracy.

Although the gradual assumption by the child of increasing areas of responsibility is essential, the teacher must determine those areas. Almost by definition, a child is not equipped to make judgments about the areas of responsibility he is capable of assuming. Our error lies in the indiscriminate use of the word democracy, so that every time the child is allowed to make a decision for himself he is told that this is democratic.

Having the child help to decide what he will eat for lunch or which of two books he will read or what game he will play can be excellent training, but it has virtually no relation to democracy. The use of this word in a wrong context has done much to subvert the true meaning and to weaken the practice of democracy.

Another common error is the use of the phrase, "We must all follow the majority rule; that is the democratic way." The advice is technically correct but can result in serious misconceptions, because the child is too immature to understand the difference between obeying and agreeing.

MR. ROBINSON (Lambda 1781) teaches social studies in the Carlmont High School, Belmont, Calif. He is a frequent KAPPAN contributor and author of "Scraps from a Teacher's Notebook."

The child must obey the rule that has been established by the teacher, whether or not pupils were consulted in the making of the decision. In a wholesome democratic setting the child should be encouraged to maintain his dissident views, express them, and work for their adoption, even while he obeys the distasteful majority rule. Because this part of the democratic concept is usually omitted from the classroom experience, the child receives a false, other-directed notion that weakens his character and pushes him one step closer to becoming a mass conformist, conditioned to accept what the majority approves.

Too often the child learns in school to equate democracy with two ideas: doing what you like if it apparently hurts no one else and following the will of the majority. Granted that these concepts are not inconsistent with a true democratic ideal, by themselves they are tragically insufficient and tend to drag democracy down to its lowest common denominator.

Still another peril lies in attempting to apply majority rule on inappropriate occasions. Democracy's toughest problem will always be the day-to-day decisions as to when the people should be consulted and when the people's representative should act on his own judgment, expert or not. Children are frequently asked to express a preference, after which the will of the majority is imposed on all in the name of democracy when the decision should have been made by each individual for himself or else by the teacher on the basis of knowledge or experience. Giving a student some leeway or option in his work assignment to provide for individual differences is reasonable. Having a class assignment determined by majority vote makes very little sense and distorts the nature of democracy. We would like to

forget the more ludicrous examples, such as the class that was asked to decide by democratic vote where Alaska is located.

One more weakness in the attempt of some schools to provide experience in democratic living is the well-known temptation to emphasize rights far more than responsibilities, a situation which leads to the anarchic or beat attitude expressed in such statements as, "I have the democratic right to do what I want and I want to do nothing. I'm not interfering with anybody else."

A more realistic approach for the schools might be to stress that democracy does not mean freedom as much as it means responsibility. Dictatorship means freedom. In a dictatorship the citizen has no need to think or to assume responsibility. The boss takes care of everything and the citizen needs only to do what he is told. Above all, students should be reminded that in a democracy agreement isn't necessary; participation is.

Some of the pitfalls, then, lie in assuming that a truly democratic classroom can be established, oversimplifying the concept of democracy, encouraging agreement with the majority, applying the voting procedure at inappropriate times, and emphasizing rights out of all proportion to responsibilities.

Yes, students should learn some democracy in school. They cannot learn it just by learning words. They must learn as much as possible by democratic experiences. But these experiences had better be carefully defined and properly executed. To a degree that is appropriate for the age group and commensurate with the academic responsibilities of the school, it had better be true democracy, with all of the rigors and responsibilities that entails, or the blessings of freedom will soon become tales told by the aging, tales of a wonderful past.

Finally, Judith Gillespie and Stuart Lazarus make some concrete suggestions on how participation skills may be taught.

Teaching Political Participation Skills

Judith Gillespie and Stuart Lazarus

Now seems to be the time to stress instruction about voting behavior. In a presidential election year, voting looms as the main kind of citizen participation. Since older teenagers have become voters, most teachers have been prompted to stress lessons about voting and elections even more than in the past.

Teaching about voting and elections is very important. However, if one wants to teach skills of effective citizen participation in government, lessons about voting are not enough, even in a presidential election year! To influence government

officials, citizens must know how to take part in politics both during and between elections. In addition, citizen contributions to problem-solving in families, schools, work settings and interest groups require political commitments and skills beyond voting. These skills usually are not taught in social studies classrooms, but they are necessary for a democratic society to sustain itself at the grass roots level.

In this article, we are concerned with a wide range of political participation skills. First, we discuss the meaning of citizen participation and the types of roles and skills that can be taught in classrooms. Second, we examine how textbooks and other social studies materials teach participant roles. Third, we present a sample lesson for teaching participation skills.

The Meaning of Political Participation

Political participation is the means by which citizens articulate and organize interests. It implies various actions which can contribute to effective citizenship. In order to achieve competent citizenship, students need to be trained in multiple citizen roles. Social stud-

ies teachers could provide an important part of this training.

Political participation is often considered the essence of American democracy. Recently, there has been criticism of some persons associated with the national government who have seemed to threaten the sustenance of democracy through unlawful or immoral actions. The apparent impotence of the average citizen is equally dangerous for the maintenance of democratic norms and procedures, since democracy is based upon skillful citizen participation.

The necessity of citizen participation in democratic societies has implications for more than the support of American government. As the world becomes increasingly interdependent, citizen roles in the global society become increasingly significant. Citizens act in schools long before they are of voting age. Many others take important participation roles in the everyday activities of communities and work settings. Many citizens set models for participation which, with the advance of media and technology, are transmitted to the global scene. A farmer in Iowa and an industrialist in New York both hold political roles in a global society which are important to the maintenance of a free and just global political network. As their ideas and actions are viewed by a larger audience, they assume responsibilities for the fate of the planet as well as the fate of the nation.

Given that citizen participation is important and has implications which stretch far beyond local arenas, *what kinds of activities give participation meaning?* Citizens are *observers*, both on the national and international scene. They gather knowledge about what is happening in local, national and international political arenas. In effect, the "silent majority" holds a crucial position in maintaining norms which are vital to any political order.

Citizens also often exert indirect pressure on many decision-makers. The role of the media in investigative reporting represents one salient example of citizen observers in action. The media reveal many inequities in the American system as well as on the global

Judith Gillespie is Co-Director of the High School Political Science Curriculum Project and a Lecturer in Political Science at Indiana University. She has written several articles on various aspects of curriculum development and political education. She is a co-author of *Comparing Political Experiences*. Stuart Lazarus is Co-Director of the *Comparing Political Experiences Diffusion Project* and an Assistant Professor of Education at Indiana University. He has written several articles about curriculum development and social studies education. He is a co-author of *Comparing Political Experiences*.



**¡ Hermanos y Hermanas
REGISTRESE
Para Votar Hoy Mismo!**

El Lugar

La Fecha

**Brothers and Sisters
REGISTER
To Vote Today!**

Place

Date

YCF youth citizenship fund, Inc. 2317 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037



"Minority viewpoints [are] necessary for consideration of a full spectrum of alternatives in making decisions. . . ."

scene. They can hold local and international governors accountable for their actions in a wide variety of ways. Watergate is only one example. The CIA exposés and the investigation of multinational corporations resulted partly from media observers who took their roles seriously. Active citizen observers have knowledge which is the key for keeping any governing body accountable and for holding open the door for participation. *Without citizen observers, democracy on any level of government would be impossible.*

Citizens also often take important roles in helping to implement political decisions. In elections, many citizens work in campaigns to help candidates through primaries and general elections. Many

interest groups which exert influence in American and global political arenas are manned largely by citizen efforts.

At the local level, *citizen support* often makes the difference in responses communities make to pressing problems of survival or quality of life. *Supporters, then, perform a vital role as they provide resources in order to implement political decisions and as they offer assurance that communities and nations will be responsive to needs in the local and global political arenas.*

Citizen advocates are also a fundamental part of the democratic process. Without people advocating their positions, the competition necessary for democracy would not be sustained. Also, the creative

ideas and minority viewpoints necessary for consideration of a full spectrum of alternatives in making decisions would not surface. Without citizen advocates and advocate groups, many national and local laws, rules and regulations would not be what they are today. *Therefore, advocates contribute new ideas and backing necessary for serious consideration of alternatives in local, national and international communities.*

Another fundamental citizen role is the *organizer*, one who gives necessary direction to citizen action. Organizers put people and resources together to move toward goals which serve their interests. Citizen organizers also perform planning duties in schools, work settings and communities which are

vital to systematic growth and change. Citizen organizers become active in the global community when they mobilize people to back or protest foreign policy or to advocate or object to consumer practices.

The four participant roles of (1) *observer*, (2) *supporter*, (3) *advocate*, and (4) *organizer* are fundamentals of a vital democracy. Thus, these roles should be basic features of citizenship education in schools.

Political Participation Skills and American Government Courses

If political participation skills need attention in the schools, one of the most logical places for their inclusion in the curriculum is through American government courses. The goal of most government courses is to produce more effective citizens. We have argued that teaching participation skills is necessary for the development of competent citizens. Thus, we raise two questions about typical high school government courses.

- (1) How much training in participation currently exists in standard American government offerings?
- (2) How can teachers expand present courses to insure student exposure to fundamental participation skills?

In order to determine how typical American government programs are providing training in political participation, we conducted a survey of twelve widely used American government textbooks.¹ We looked for ways in which participation activities are built into these programs.

There are several ways in which teaching participation skills might be approached. *First*, programs which carry cases that focus on major political actors set models for students' participation. These cases illustrate how students might transfer their knowledge into political action. Simulated role-play exercises represent a *second* way in which participation might be improved. These exercises afford students opportunities to practice political participation in the classroom. Students can practice a variety of roles and, it is hoped, transfer these roles into their everyday lives.

A *third* way in which programs can improve participation is through direct activities on the part of students themselves. They can engage in activities in their community, work setting and school which call for a variety of types of political action. These programs offer students direct experiences in political participation.

Most of the government programs in our survey reflected few or none of these means for teaching political participation skills. However, three of the texts studied use cases which set models for political participation: (1) *American Government: Continuity and Change*, (2) *American Government in Action*, and (3) *American Political Behavior*. In many of these case studies, students are asked to make value decisions about some issue. Yet they are rarely asked to talk about their own roles in participating in the political system.

A teacher who wants to use these cases as models for effective citizen participation can easily add questions to those found in the text and amplify students' awareness of participation skills. The questions could focus on roles of individuals involved in the cases and possible student roles in the political life of schools, work settings and commu-

nities. Teachers could ask these types of questions:

- (1) Who are the central political actors in this case?
- (2) What did they do to achieve their goals?
- (3) Are there people you know who have carried out similar actions?
- (4) Do you think you might play a similar part in issues that concern you?
- (5) How might you carry out your political activities differently?

Through questions such as these, teachers can adapt existing programs to increase students' knowledge of political participation and roles they might play in political situations.

Some of the materials also provide simulated role-play exercises through which students can practice participation skills. Two books provide many role-play exercises: (1) *Voices for Justice* and (2) *American Government in Action*. However, the activities highlight institutionalized political roles. Students take the role of a legislator or a judge rather than roles that they might take in their everyday lives.

Teachers could transfer the essential political characteristics of leadership and decision-making in these simulations to a variety of local situations. They could also help to stimulate student transfer of these role-play exercises into roles that they could take in schools, communities and work settings. The key to this procedure is to restructure the questions asked after the role-play exercises as indicated below:

- (1) What are the characteristics of an effective leader?
- (2) How did you exercise leadership in the simulation?
- (3) How might your leadership skills be used in situations you encounter daily?

Students might then be asked to observe roles of leaders in groups with which they are familiar in their school or community. Then they could report to the class and compare leadership, decision-making or other activities with the simulated classroom situations.

Certainly, the most effective way to teach about political participation skills is through direct partici-

¹Following are books examined for the review: Miriam R. Resnick and Lillian H. Nerenberg, *American Government in Action* (Columbus, Oh.: Charles Merrill Company, 1973); Stuart G. Brown, Russell F. Farnen, and Charles L. Peltier, *Government: The American System* (Riverside, N.J.: Macmillan, 1973); Bernard Feder, *The Process of American Government: Cases and Problems* (N.Y.: Noble and Noble, 1972); Robert Carter and John N. Richards, *Of, By and For the People* (Westchester, Ill.: Benefic Press, 1972); William Ebenstein and Edward W. Mill, *American Government in the Twentieth Century: A Process Approach* (Morristown, N.J.: Silver Burdett, 1973); Allen Schnick and Adrienne Pfister, *American Government: Continuity and Change* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1972); William H. Hartley and William S. Vincent, *American Civics* (N.Y.: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1974); Charles N. Quigley and Richard P. Longaker, *Voices for Justice: Role Playing in Democratic Procedures* (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1974); Barry E. Lefkowitz, *Fair Trial vs. Free Press* (A project of the Institute for Political and Legal Education, Pitman, N.J., 1975); Howard Mehlinger and John Patrick, *American Political Behavior* (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1972); Edwin Fenton, Anthony N. Penna, and Mindella Schultz, *Comparative Political Systems* (N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973); William A. McClenaghan, *Magruder's American Government* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1974). The authors would like to thank Bruce Smith at the Social Studies Development Center, Indiana University, for his research contribution to this review of textbooks.

SAMPLE LESSON

Learning a Participant Role

Background on Local 543 of the United Auto Workers

Local 543 is having a union meeting. It has been on strike for three days and members are debating whether or not to go back to work. Going off strike and back to work is an important event, for going back to work means that they will get full salary, and many members really need the money. However, some members feel that continuing the strike is necessary for the solidarity of the union.

The issue over which they are striking was raised by one of the workers getting hurt on the assembly line. Faulty equipment was used in the plant and the worker is in the hospital. Several of the workers had told their supervisor that the faulty equipment should be repaired. Management had postponed those repairs. Now someone was hurt.

This issue is an important one for Local

543. The Local is broke and it cannot pay strike benefits to those **workers who are** off the job. The workers do not get any money to feed their families while they are out of work. The Local has struck many times before and that is why the strike fund is low. On the other hand, it doesn't want to give in to management. Management had clearly postponed making the repairs because it felt it could get away with it. The union wants to demonstrate solidarity in strikes so that management will be more responsive in the future.

The Local is having a series of meetings over the next few days to decide what to do. Almost everyone is talking in small groups about what to do about the strike.

* * * * *

Role Profile: The Observer

You will play an observer role in this situation. As the group attempts to make a decision, act out your role as best you can. When the group is finished, you should all discuss your role performance. Use the questions below as guides for discussion. Fill in the answers and save this sheet for later class discussion.

1. What were the major topics discussed in the conversation?
2. Did you enter the conversation in any way?
3. What kinds of things might an observer suggest or do to aid these people in solving their problem?
4. What did you do well as an observer in this situation? What suggestions do you or others have for improving your role performance?

pation in schools, communities and work settings. One of the programs in our survey, *Fair Trial vs. Free Press*, provides a unit of instruction designed to help students participate in structured out-of-class activities in the community. This course offers avenues for students to gain direct experience in political participation which is well integrated with knowledge and skills learned in the classroom. Some of these activities could be adapted and introduced in any government program.

In all of these ways, present government materials provide possibilities to help students learn participation skills. Students should have government courses which teach participation skills through system-

atic and carefully designed role-play exercises which are tied to basic knowledge and intellectual skill components. As this type of instructional material often is not available from publishers, existing textbooks can be adapted as we have suggested to teach citizen participation skills.

A Sample Lesson in Political Participation

It may be useful for teachers to introduce new lessons in their courses to maximize student training in fundamental participation skills. Thus, we have provided a sample lesson (see above) with instructions for its adaptation to various types of exercises in participation. The lesson and adaptations

are taken directly from the final experimental version of *Comparing Political Experiences*, a program now in the process of development. The sample lesson is part of the participation component involving the development of skills in playing four important citizen roles: observer, supporter, advocate and organizer.

The sample lesson includes background material and role profiles for training in the observer role. Observers are very significant in group situations. People can listen carefully and contribute to groups by thinking about what is going on. They can also provide important support for decisions that are made. Therefore, the observer role becomes a key to introducing stu-

• • • • •

Role Profile: Mr./Ms. Newcomb

The Newcombs have worked on the assembly line all of their lives. They have two teenage children who are about to go off to college. They need money badly. They feel that they should go back to work whatever the conditions. Otherwise they will not make ends meet.

The Newcombs also feel that there are too many strikes. The Local seems to strike over every issue, and more things need to be worked out with management. Besides, they will be forced to go back anyway by the courts. Going back voluntarily might make management happier, and therefore it will be more likely to respond to grievances in the future.

Play the roles of Mr. and Ms. Newcomb in the group of three in which you will be working. Try to decide what recommendation for action the group can make at the next local union meeting.

• • • • •

Role Profile: Mr./Ms. Hart

The Harts are concerned about the strike. They don't have much money coming in. However, they feel it is wrong to give in to management. If the auto workers are ever to have any better quality working facilities, they cannot give in to management. They need to demonstrate that theirs is a strong union and that they will strike over issues such as management postponing repairs on the assembly line. They also feel that the union needs to show solidarity. Without solidarity between members, the union will certainly fail.

They also have a deep concern for safety. They feel that the Auto Workers Union represents safety and the union has given them tremendous safety benefits in the past. If they do not strike with the union and demonstrate their right to strike, the safety standards could be worsened in the future.

Play the roles of Mr. and Ms. Hart in the group of three in which you will be working. Try to decide what recommendation for action the group can make at the next local union meeting.

dents to participation and giving them experience in working in group situations when less initiative is required than for some other roles.

In order to complete this activity, teachers should introduce students to these characteristics of successful observer role behavior. A successful observer:

- (1) Listens carefully to group discussions;
- (2) Obtains information about the issues under discussion;
- (3) Refrains from disrupting group activity in any way or from making suggestions;
- (4) Attempts to think about how he/she might help the group in the future.

These characteristics should be

explained to students, and examples should be given from school, community and work settings with which the teacher and students are familiar. After students know the characteristics of an observer role, the teacher should introduce the background sheet and have students read it. When students have read the background information, they should break into groups of threes and take one of the three roles for the activity: One student should take a pro role, one should take a con role, and another student should serve as an observer. Students should be allowed ten minutes to discuss the issue and reach some decision, if possible, in the group about the issue. They should then discuss the observer's

role according to the questions on the observer role sheet. Three rounds of the role play should be done so that each student has the opportunity to serve as an observer. Students should change groups and roles for each round.

The teachers should then discuss in class the performance of the observer role in various groups. Ask students whether or not they followed the criteria for a successful observer and how they might improve their performance.

Students can then apply their skills in school, work setting, or community situations which are relevant to them. Students might identify a school group or a community group where they can participate on a regular basis and perform

an observer role in one of the group meetings. Students can conduct this activity in pairs so that one student serves as an observer and another provides an evaluation of the observer's performance. In this way, students learn about participant roles and can apply them in group settings.

Teaching Other Participant Roles

Other roles can be adapted from the model presented in the sample lesson. Criteria for other types of roles are listed below.

Supporter Role/A Successful Supporter:

1. Is reliable
2. Takes directions
3. Works hard
4. Works well with others
5. Is thorough and careful in his/her work

Advocate Role/A Successful Advocate:

1. Knows the general feelings of the group about an issue
2. States a clear position on an issue
3. Presents reasons for his/her position
4. Knows how to influence others (knows their interests and what will satisfy them)

Organizer Role/A Successful Organizer:

1. Plans group activities
 2. Matches people and tasks according to individuals' skills
 3. Clearly identifies goals and priorities
 4. Establishes clear roles and good working relationships among individuals
-

These are the criteria for different role-play situations which might be developed by using the same procedures as those used in the observer-role sample lesson.

Developing a background summary for any role-play exercise involves an issue. Any issue you think is relevant to students will set the stage for the role-play exercise. Be sure the issue allows for student opportunities to exhibit supporter, advocate or organizer roles. Cues in the background profiles for supporters would include focusing the major issue on the implementation of a decision, such as building a new park in a community or creating a new club in the school. Cues for the advocate roles include an issue which allows people to take strong pro or con positions. Cues

for the organizer role involve an issue around which groups can be organized in order to get things done. With these cues in the background profiles, almost any issue can provide a backdrop for the role-play exercises.

In developing role profiles for the activities, three profiles need to be created. *Two role profiles* are created in which one person takes a pro position and another takes a con position on the issues posed in the background information. These role profiles should illustrate salient characteristics of the pro or con position wrapped around the description of an individual who is likely to participate in the issue set forth in the background sheet.

The third role profile is for the supporter, advocate or organizer. It should be developed so that the role player can evaluate his/her performance and discuss improvement in that performance with other players. Adaptations can be made from the questions in the observer-role profile presented here to guide discussion following the role-play activity.

These procedures are guidelines to developing other role activities based on the observer role. A teacher also might want students to practice their skills in settings in their school, work place or community. They can find a group in which they are active and observe the role behavior of others as well as carry out roles and have peers evaluate their performance according to the questions provided in the role-play exercises.

Expanding Participation Skills

As can be seen through this article, participation skills are relatively easy to integrate into any social studies program. These skills are an important dimension of citizenship which will, it is hoped, broaden the ways in which people contribute to local, national and global communities.

Many of the roles which are illustrated here carry distinct global aspects. For example, students are observers of the global scene. Teachers might want to integrate the present observer-role activities with an analysis of the newspaper and talk about students' knowledge of global events and how they act

as observers of the global scene. This is one way to demonstrate the relevance of global activities to students as well as to increase their perspective on the citizenship roles which they take. Supporter roles also have important global implications. For example, an analysis of buying patterns and ways in which people are dependent upon such products as oil and food will demonstrate to students that they are direct supporters of global economic and political activities.

Advocate and organizer roles in global politics are defined less directly. However, when students support positions and perceptions of other people, they become advocates of norm-setting in a global arena. Students might increase their understanding of the global role that advocates take by stating their positions on an issue which they think is locally or nationally relevant and then attempting to generalize the impact of the issues on the global scene. They can see how their attitudes and opinions about everyday life form part of the fabric of global policy making.

Everyone also may be an organizer on the global scene. Any time that a group is organized effectively and a task is implemented, its impact may have global ramifications. For example, students might ask how activities at their school contribute to organizations with worldwide networks. They also might determine how common local problems and solutions to those problems are transformed as ideas in a diffusion network that is global in its scope and implications. These types of exercises could help students to see the global aspects of their citizenship roles.

We hope that this article will help teachers to adapt models presented here in a variety of ways so that they might teach citizenship roles more effectively. Undoubtedly, teachers are already using some participant role-learning activities in their classrooms. The authors would like to use this article as the basis for an extended idea exchange. We are eager to hear how readers of this article are already incorporating the learning of participation skills in classrooms. If you have ideas to share, please contact us. ■

empowerment

Jesse Jackson,
"Give the People a Vision." Page 75.

Christine B. Button,
"Political Education for Minority
Groups." Page 90.

Edward Schwartz,
"Building Community." Page 85.

Trade Union Women's Studies,
"Grievance Handling for Effectiveness." Page 94.

Empowerment

Empowerment does not mean simply the gaining of power. It signifies something both more subtle and complex: acquiring a sense of direction and the learning of the skills and self-discipline necessary to carry one through the arduous struggle for control over one's life. Skills taught in isolation from an inspiring vision produce proficient people without a purpose. But a focus on the symbols of dignity and pride that is lacking in practical and informative content only fills people's minds with empty delusions. A comprehensive strategy for empowerment must convey both purpose and practical knowledge.

The first reading in this section, Jesse Jackson's "Give the People a Vision" is one of the clearest statements of the need for such a dual approach to the education for empowerment. It will readily become apparent however, that the task that Jackson has set for us transcends the classroom and demands a combined effort of all citizen educators--parents, churches, unions, schools and concerned community groups. Thus, the selections that follow Jackson's speech present strategies for empowerment that may be employed within the schools, one that is utilized by a neighborhood education project, and one in union education.

"Give the People a Vision"

Jesse L. Jackson

It is time, I believe, to reexamine the causes of the social and economic plight in which black Americans--and particularly the poor blacks of the Northern cities--still find themselves, despite the legal advances of the 60's. Since so many past analyses of this problem have failed to bring about satisfactory improvement, I think it is time to suggest some new approaches, based largely on new values. It is my view that such a fresh start offers the best hope not only of lifting up the black people but of saving America's cities...

As a starting point, let us take a noteworthy statistic: There are now 130 black mayors in the United States. We blacks have populated the cities; we must now learn to run them. The need is urgent. The ethical collapse, the heroin epidemic, the large number of our people who are out of work and on welfare, and the disruptive violence in our schools all indicate that the cities may be destroying us.

The thrust of my argument is that black Americans must begin to accept a larger share of responsibility for their lives. For too many years we have been crying that racism and oppression have kept us down. That is true, and racism and oppression have to be fought on every front. But to fight any battle takes soldiers who are strong, healthy, spirited, committed, well-trained and confident. This is particularly true when the enemy is as tough and elusive as American racism. I don't believe that we will produce strong soldiers by moaning about what the enemy has done to us.

Jesse Jackson is the director of PUSH (People United to Save Humanity.) This selection is excerpted from The New York Times Magazine, April 18, 1976.

It is time, I think, for us to stand up, admit to our failures and weaknesses and begin to strengthen ourselves. Here are some of the things I am talking about.

There is a definite welfare mentality in many black communities that derives perhaps from slavery but that must now be overcome.

We have become politically apathetic. Only 7 million of the 14 million eligible black voters are registered to vote. Yet politics is one key to self-development. In terms of votes, we have more potential strength than labor or any other single bloc. We have a responsibility to use it to the full.

We too often condemn blacks who succeed and excel, calling them Toms and the like, when the ideal ought to be for all of us to succeed and excel.

We are allowing a minuscule minority of criminals in our midst to create disorder, ruin our schools and sap the energy we need to rebuild our neighborhoods and our cities.

Many leaders who are black, and many white liberals, will object to my discussing these things in public. But the decadence in black communities--killings, destruction of our own businesses, violence in the schools--is already in the headlines; the only question is what we should do about it. Others will object that to demand that we must meet the challenge of self-government is to put too much pressure on the victims of ancient wrongs. Yet in spite of these objections, in spite of yesterday's agony, liberation struggles are built on sweat and pain rather than tears and complaints.

In facing up to the new reality of black concentration in the Northern cities, the flight of whites to the suburbs, and the decay of the inner cities--particularly their black communities--in many parts of the country, many black and white leaders demand Federal aid as the only solution. More Federal aid is certainly needed, but money alone, or in combination with minor reforms, will not significantly change the welfare system, reduce crime, build enough new houses, improve education, restore stable families or eliminate drug abuse. A multitude of Federal antipoverty and urban-renewal programs should have proved that by now. But if more Federal money will not solve the problem, what will?

It has been fascinating for me to observe what has happened in South Vietnam in the past year. The new Saigon leaders have spent little time talking about the Americans who carpet-bombed and defoliated their country. Instead, they have concentrated on rebuilding, putting people to work, inculcating new values and attitudes. They did it with military authority and a liberated attitude. We black Americans can rebuild our communities with moral authority. We need a blueprint, such as an urban Marshall Plan, but at its base there must be moral authority and sound ethical conduct...

We need to tell our young people in those cities: "All right, we'll get all the state and Federal money that we can; but first and foremost, we need to put your hands and your bodies and your minds to work building our communities." What we must do for our young people is challenge them to put hope in their brains rather than dope in their veins. What difference does it make if the doors swing wide open if our young people are too dizzy to walk through them?

I often wonder what would happen if Coleman Young, the Mayor of Detroit, who has inherited a city of much moral and economic decay, were to go into one of Detroit's stadiums and had 50,000 or 60,000 people in there--just as Jomo Kenyatta has done, and Castro, and President Samora Machel of Mozambique--and delivered a resounding State of Detroit message.

"All right, people," he could say, "Detroit needs 200 doctors in the next 10 to 15 years, and here is what we will do to make certain that it happens. And we will need 200 lawyers and 400 electricians and 250 nurses, and here is what we will do to make sure it happens. I cannot pass a law about these things, but I am appealing to you parents and you children to cooperate. Parents, you must keep your children home every night from 7 to 9 to study, and get them into bed by 10. Every morning the city will provide physical-training directors in the city parks. We will close off one block in every neighborhood for half an hour every morning for exercise--we want you out there getting your bodies healthy for this struggle for independence."...

There is another parallel with the third world that is very much to the point. The emerging countries have had to proceed by stages--from a situation in which they were outright colonies, and their white rulers simply grabbed up the countries' natural resources; to a state of neocolonialism, in which the people attained nominal independence but the former colonizers remained in de facto control of the resources, which they continued to exploit primarily for their own benefit; to a situation of real independence in which the people take over control of their resources and work out mutually beneficial production arrangements with the former colonizers.

We black Americans feel we have been exploited, too, although the natural resources we had to offer were not minerals in the ground or produce in the field but the human resources of brain and brawn. And we feel we are at a stage at which we can emulate the third-world countries by moving from "neocolonialism" as it were, to real "independence". The lessons, of course, must be applied to situations that often are vastly different from those facing the leaders of the economically underdeveloped countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America, but the principle of self-reliance in place of dependency is the same.

Let me give a practical example. In the 60's, many black leaders, myself included, were picketing in front of Sears and A. & P. and other supermarkets in the black neighborhoods, demanding more and better jobs for blacks and more equitable financial arrangements with the community. And we succeeded. Some of these stores began to appoint black managers, put products of black companies on their shelves, hire black contractors for building new stores, and place their accounts in black-

controlled banks. But today we find ourselves in Chicago, East Orange, N.J. and elsewhere, lying down at Sears' back doors begging the man not to fire us all and close down.

We want those white-owned branches, with the services and jobs they provide to stay, but if they want to go, we should not be left with nothing to take their place. The point is that if we had pulled together in the intervening decade, if we had not lost so many good minds to the jails and the drug culture, if we had taken the pooling of our money more seriously, we would today have the ready capital and trained managers and communal organization to buy out those white-controlled stores that want to close down, direct all black business to them, and make them economically successful. But that takes discipline and purpose and dedicated leadership at many levels, and that is where I think the experience of the third-world countries can be of help to us.

It is bad to be in the worst slums in the country; it is even worse if those slums are internalized, become part of you. Hence the therapeutic effect of the Black Power symbolism of the 60's. But some black students became so caught up in the symbolism of black liberation that they forgot about such basic skills as reading, writing, and thinking.

God knows I recognize the need for black self-pride. But that monument must be built on a solid foundation; we must not, as Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. used to say, confuse symbolism with substance...

In the last 10 to 12 years, many of us missed the chance to grow intellectually and chased Superfly instead. Many of us spent more time on lottery and luck than looking for a job. Many of us did not use the opportunities we had. But it is time to cut that now. That backward trend goes against our own best traditions. Africa's great leaders, from Nkrumah to Machel, have all been learned men.

Preoccupation with symbolism has also made it hard for many of us to distinguish service from servility.

As I travel around the country, I often eat in restaurants run by the Nation of Islam. One reason is that the waiters are the most courteous and prompt you will find anywhere. They enjoy serving black people: you will never find a Muslim waiter with an "attitude." Unfortunately, the same is not true of all blacks. I know of black contractors who have gone out of business because their black workers were not prompt or had negative attitudes. I know young black workers who talk with pride about going to work any hour they feel like it, taking a day off when they feel like it, wearing Apple Caps on the job, playing loud portable radios on the assembly line. They're rebelling against the system, they say; they're exhibiting their independence. (There are many white workers it should be added, who do the same.) What they're really exhibiting is ignorance of a tradition of work in the black community that is one of our proudest legacies.

Slavery is over now, but you can't free a man who still has a slave mentality, just as you can't enslave a man who has a free spirit. We don't need to carry chips on our shoulders, fearing we are being treated in a servile manner. This does not mean we cannot be angry and loud and ornery on occasion, as all mortals have a way of being, but we should always try to use the power that derives from true courtesy.

The greatest potential for self-development is to be found in the public schools in our cities. That is also where there is now the greatest potential for explosions. Predominantly black schools in most urban areas with high concentrations of black people--New York, Washington, Detroit, Chicago, Los Angeles, St. Louis, Boston--are largely out of control. Violence against students and teachers, perpetrated by students, is steadily and dangerously increasing. Drug abuse is an accepted fact of life; pushers operate freely in many schools, and police patrol the corridors. Discipline has broken down. In a number of New York schools, teachers complain that the places are run not by the principals but by the gangs. We need to change this because it is morally right, because it is necessary for our development, and because no one else is going to do it for us.

The principals are not alone: Parents, teachers, superintendents, school boards have all failed to impose discipline and create a proper atmosphere for learning. And if our young people are not learning today, we will not have the doctors, engineers, lawyers, mechanics, nurses, clerks, and accountants that we will need to manage the cities.

A few years ago there was a sizable movement for community control of the public schools. But the community-control movement never did seriously address the problem of control of the students by their parents. Many black students turned the movement into a cynical rebellion against any authority--black or white, sympathetic or unsympathetic, healthy or destructive. A people seeking independence cannot tolerate that.

A related problem is the misconception, perpetrated on many parents, that a parent with little formal education is in a position to dictate on pedagogical matters to teachers and educators. Parents have something more fundamental to offer: motivation, love, care, discipline--and sometimes chastisement. Children cannot be allowed to play the game of "teach me if you can catch me." Children must be taught that they have a responsibility to learn as well as a right to an education. Busing is absolutely necessary, but without a will to learn, busing is irrelevant.

With all that in mind PUSH (People United to Save Humanity), the organization that I direct from Chicago, has begun a national program, "PUSH for Excellence," to address urban problems, beginning with the public schools. The models for this project are in Washington, Los Angeles and Chicago, but we have already found great interest in the approach in other cities.

We have begun in Washington by stimulating high-school students to organize a city-wide Council Against Drugs, Racism and Violence and for Discipline. A student conference will be held by this council in the spring. We have had large numbers of students turn out for planning meetings, and we have aroused substantial mass support at high-school assemblies. Parallel and sometimes coordinated meetings have been held with teachers, athletic coaches, superintendents and school boards. Mayor Walter Washington has shown great interest--as have Mayors Maynard Jackson of Atlanta, Coleman Young of Detroit, Richard Hatcher of Gary, Indiana and Thomas Bradley of Los Angeles for similar initiatives in their cities.

Our program is simple. We want to get black men from the neighborhoods to replace the police in patrolling the school corridors and the street corners where the dope pushers operate. We want all parents to reserve the evening hours of 7 to 9 for their children's homework. We want student leaders and athletes to help identify and solve discipline problems before they get out of control. We want the black-oriented media to find ways to publicly reward achievers. We want the black disc jockeys who reach more black kids than the school principals, to inform and inspire as well as entertain.

A second element in our program is the black church. The church is the most stable influence in the black communities. It is the only place where all segments of the community come together, once a week. An estimated 11 to 13 million men, women and children are members of black churches. Historically, the black church has been involved in or behind every black movement of any significance. I have been involved with high schools in Washington, Chicago and Los Angeles that are working with churches, and if there is anything the experience has shown me, it is that black ministers still carry moral authority with our people, except for a hardcore few, and most people want moral authority.

America is in the midst of a crisis, both in regard to its cities and in regard to its position in the world. Black Americans, inheritors of the role of the restless and disenfranchised minorities of the past who helped make America strong, have a historic opportunity to show that the cities can be saved. We can do so by stimulating change in the schools and the communities we control...

The first and immediate task for American blacks is to rise up from the decadence in which we too often find ourselves in the cities, and to do so by the force of our will, our intellect, our energy and our faith in ourselves. It is a historic opportunity we cannot afford to miss.

Besides working in cooperation with church and community groups, what specific changes might be implemented within the curriculum of the schools? The following essay by Christine B. Button, "Political Education for minority groups", offers an approach that aims at increasing feelings of efficacy and enhancing self-image through the successful experience of political analysis and problem solving within the schools. The ultimate goal, however, is to insure that this new confidence and these new talents "spill over" into the actual political sphere.

"Political Education for Minority Groups"
Christine Bennett Button

Political education in American secondary schools is under vigorous attack. Most of the criticism focuses upon the "unrealistic" and ethnocentric interpretation of government with its emphasis on the study of government structure and institutions, while the study of political behavior, processes, and conflict are largely ignored (Hess and other, 1968; "Political Education in the Public Schools," 1971). According to

Christine Bennett Button teaches at the University of Texas in Austin. The complete article from which this was excerpted appeared in The Politics of Future Citizens, edited by Richard G. Niemi. The original article contains specific examples of curriculum material and a statistical evaluation of the program's results.

Massialas, "what is presently offered in the school is basically obsolete, irrelevant, and has no social or political significance" (1972, p. xii). Hess (1969) writes that the emphasis the school puts on stability and consensus contributes to the very fragmentation which political socialization is meant to prevent. Most American school children develop a highly idealized view of government and remain ignorant of legitimate channels of political influence other than voting. Such patterns of political socialization apparently are leading "more toward compliance and complacency on the one hand, and toward disillusionment, helplessness, anger, and perhaps even rejections of the system on the other" (P.25 Messialas)

While the criticism is clearly justified, it also implies that the schools can make a difference--an assumption not consistently supported by research (Langton and Jennings, 1968). Research is desperately needed, to illustrate the possible impact of alternative curricula on the political attitudes and behaviors of American youth.

A current review of the most outstanding social-studies curriculum projects (Krug, Poster, and Gillies, 1970) indicates that most programs establish learning objectives which are consistent with those recently set up by the Committee on Pre-Collegiate Education. American Political Science Association ("Political Education in the Public Schools," 1971). The Committee's objectives include knowledge of political "realities" as well as institutions and structures; knowledge of international political systems; understanding of political socialization processes; thinking, inquiry, and judgement skills; understanding of participatory skills and capacities; and the development of such political orientations as interest, feelings of efficacy, and so on. Attitudes are the focus of many of these objectives. While educators often expect to influence student attitudes, however, there is little evidence that they do. Perhaps they fail because they make little or no attempt to modify and measure changes in student behavior in either the classroom or more importantly, in the community. Despite growing evidence that behavior modification may be crucial in promoting attitudinal change, innovation in social studies education has been largely limited to canned inquiry episodes, problem "solving," and value-clarification models contrived for the classroom...

...Many people argue that educators do not have the right to attempt to change student attitudes--that students have a right to their own biases, prejudices, and apathy. These people forget that society, including the school, does mold and socialize. The question is, what values, attitudes, and behaviors should be promoted? I take the position here that educators must promote belief in the basic democratic values (such as political participation, majority rule and minority rights, human brotherhood and concern for community, and the right of dissent) and behavior that is consistent with these beliefs.

Thus, I developed experimental units in government and tested the extent to which these units influenced the political orientations of Anglo, Black, and Mexican-American twelfth graders. My curriculum focused on modifying student behavior, but I discovered that behavior modification, although necessary, is not a sufficient ingredient. Equally important are students' self-analysis of their own political socialization and their study of political involvement and change.

Experimental Curriculum

The overriding goal of the experimental units was to "teach for political efficacy" (C. Button, 1971). This goal was based on research which indicates that among important segments of American youth, feelings of political effectiveness and trust decrease as children reach adolescence. To teach young people to be more effective political actors, we educators must increase their feelings of political effectiveness. Assuming that we can do this, how should we do it?

In my experimental units, I concentrated on getting students to think about the development and use of political strategy to bring about social and political change and to become involved in community action related to their study. I developed the lessons and materials for these units during the six months preceding the experimental period. Herbert Hirsch, Associate Professor of Government (University of Texas at Austin), and Frances Nesmith, Supervisor of Social Studies in the Austin Independent School District reviewed and critiqued the units.

Unit One emphasized each student's analysis of his own political socialization, particularly the key agents which have shaped his present political attitudes. The most meaningful and motivating place for the student to begin an exploration of the political system is within himself. Furthermore, individuals who are apathetic, politically angry, or racist can liberate themselves by discovering how these orientations develop and change and how they influence and are influenced by behavior and experience. In addition to introspection, students explored the meaning of political socialization by observing the process among small children, Appalachian Americans, and non-Anglo minorities. They then analyzed the "vicious cycle of political alienation" and how it might be broken.

In Unit Two the students are introduced to elitist theories of the American political system. Key questions for the student to ask and explore included: Who rules America? What political linkages exist between those who hold power and those who do not? How does institutional racism operate in the political system? Students formed small groups to explore "realistic" political problems that occur in a power structure of both a single ruling elite and plural elites. Working in groups of five or six, nearly all students became involved in attempting to resolve hypothetical political problems. This activity is based upon the theory that student participation in an open-class atmosphere increases feelings of efficacy. Students are expected to pick up ideas in the classroom for solving actual political or social problems that confront them outside the classroom; the sense of efficacy gained in the classroom should "spill over" into the actual political sphere. This is especially true in this case since students were involved in social or political fieldwork in the other units.

Unit Three posed the question: How have some dissatisfied groups attempted to change America? Students analyzed channels for exercising political influence and promoting change. Much of the material focused upon racial or poverty-ridden minorities, but each individual student was reminded that he might at some time find himself in a political-minority position. Students used historical and current case studies to examine recurring techniques (such as parties, coalitions, elections, and interest groups) and time-specific techniques (such as sit-ins, boycotts, freedom rides) for bringing about political and social change. To counterbalance two possible myths about American history--that progress has been mainly peaceful with little violent protest and that community violence is a phenomenon unique to

Black Americans--"mainstream" protest and political violence throughout American history were surveyed, using an evolution-to-revolution continuum. Patterns of political protest and influence employed by Black and Chicano groups were then examined in perspective.

Students also explored the goals and effectiveness of political violence in America. An in-depth analysis of the 1965 Watts riot was used to probe the validity of the "riff-raff" theory that characterizes people who riot and to begin examining the causes and meaning of riots in general. The goals, techniques, and effectiveness of nonviolent civil disobedience were examined. Speeches and letters of Martin Luther King and Cesar Chavez were used as expressions of the basic philosophy; examples such as the Montgomery bus boycott and the California grape-picker strikes were examined as instances of the philosophy in action. The historical development and current meanings of both the Brown Power and Black Power movements were also analyzed.

Unit Four involved student action research in the community. Early in the experimental period each student selected a community problem of interest to him, explored it, and worked on it by himself or in a small group for about four months. Thus the student could apply the concepts and skills learned in the classroom by extending the learning environment into the actual political structure.

The experimental period lasted four months during the fall semester, 1971. During this time, students in the contrast groups were taught according to the government-curriculum guide of the Austin Independent School District (1966). The guide emphasized the study of government structures and institutions. Teacher-directed discussion was the main teaching strategy used in all contrast classrooms. In both the contrast and experimental groups, students had similar perceptions of teacher knowledge, preparation, and enthusiasm and of the "freedom for student expression" and the "openness" of the classroom climate...

Implications for Political Education

...The content focus of the experimental course was on political change, including behavioral and attitudinal aspects of political participation, as well as models of political change. This content should become part of political education curricula. Educators should promote the belief that political and social change is necessary and good; that American society has problems (a "reality" students are well aware of); that there are means by which citizens can work to resolve these problems; and that when the channels of political change within the system are closed to certain groups, conflict (not necessarily violent) may emerge. Conflict should be treated as creative rather than necessarily destructive, because eventually it may open up avenues of participation to those who have been excluded. Conflict is thus a vital and constructive aspect of the American political system.

Since the goal of the experimental curriculum was to effect political attitudes which would help students to be more effective political participants, several teaching strategies were designed to take students beyond merely studying, reading, and talking about the course content. In addition to open-class discussion, a technique used extensively in the contrast groups as well as in the experimental groups, three techniques were used

to modify student behavior and thought: depthful introspection by each student; small-group "problem resolving" before and after analysis of political change and system models; and fieldwork within the political structure of the student's community. I proposed that these strategies also be incorporated into political education curricula.

Each strategy directly modifies the student's thinking or behavior within a politically relevant context, but more is involved. The self-analysis of political socialization encourages students to expand inward and to analyze the psychological and social processes which shape their own perceptions of political reality. As one black girl from the experimental group at school B put it: "For a while I've been feeling kind of down on the establishment, and when I found out how you can be influenced this way--how some groups can make you feel effective and others make you feel alienated, I had to stop and think. You begin to realize all the influences around you, and it made me feel a little bit less down on the establishment, because like the Black Panthers can have this influence."

And educators must also encourage students to expand outward--to go beyond the classroom and the school, into the political structure of their community and beyond. Fieldwork, or action research, helps the student become a self-directed learner and makes political education a part of his life, rather than a preparation for work experience in these terms, revealing an enhanced self-direction and a direct link between what she was learning in government class and experiencing in her community: "Speeding is a real problem over here (East Austin)...People get hurt... We chose the speeding problem for our research. We had to contact officials and police...,and we were successful. That made us feel a lot better. If it worked once you can do it again."

Finally, this study has clear implications for the political education of minority groups, who especially benefited from the study of models of political change, combined with political socialization self-analysis. The apparent impact from the experimental units on the Black and Mexican-American students who experienced them is typified by the following statement made by a Black male student, in describing his government course: "It was a very relevant part of my education...Now, if I want to change something I know how to do it. Knowing keeps me from being as pessimistic and apathetic as I was, and I don't feel as if I'm as pessimistic as I was, and this is one of the things that brings tension and violence. If you don't know how to participate in your government, you're going to be very frustrated because the government is going to kick you around 'til you know how to use it."

The final selection on empowerment is drawn from the text "Building Community" designed for use in the Neighborhood Leadership Academy of the Institute for the Study of Civic Values. In this first of a series of courses neighborhood activists are encouraged to discuss not simply the values by which they seek to live, but also the just strategies for achieving this end.

"Building Community"
Edward Schwartz

INTRODUCTION AND SYLLABUSA. Purpose

The aim of the course will be to help neighborhood leaders examine the possibilities of building active community organizations within neighborhoods in Philadelphia. Specifically, we will be exploring the common values upon which such organizations might be based. The first part of this course will explore expectations within neighborhoods about three areas of central concern to all communities--security, reciprocity, and fellowship. From there, the seminar will examine the central value that should govern all communities--justice. Then students will explore how different attitudes about justice will affect neighborhood attitudes on how to respond to issues of security, reciprocity, and justice. In practical terms, the first part of the seminar will identify the goals around which community organizations might form; the second part, assess the extent to which neighborhood residents agree on strategies to achieve these goals.

We divide the text into eight units. Readings will be provided for each unit, to be used as the basis for discussion. We also suggest several questions for these discussions. Yet as important as the questions is the social contract technique upon which they are based.

B. The Social Contract Theory

Community activists often complain about the breakdown of neighborhood values, but they have little idea as to how to restore them. Nor do current techniques in values education offer much to civic leaders in developing strong authority at the neighborhood level. "Values clarification," for example, aims at helping students tolerate differences in values and points of view, as well as to understand their own values. It does not provide for the development of common values that the students will take seriously as essential to social and political well-being.

The problem of cultivating collective values is hardly new, however. It is the central task of all political systems. If Americans have become so individualistic that we cannot even figure out how to share common principles, then perhaps we must return to the technique by which political communities are often established--the social contract.

Social contract theory dates back to the 17th and 18th centuries, during the earliest transformation between Monarchical and Parliamentary political systems. The first major contract theorist, Thomas Hobbes, argued that human beings in a "state of nature" would agree to a social contract pledging absolute obedience to a sovereign, in order to avoid the "war of all against all" that would develop without common law and government to regulate our behavior. John Locke, considered to be the philosophical ancestor of America, argued several years later in 1690 that a fair social contract should hold the government, as well as the citizens, accountable to the broader public standards of preserving life, liberty, and property. If a government ignored these basic principles, then the citizens should have the right to overthrow the government. Writing in France, Jean Jacques Rousseau went even further. He insisted that the only just contract was one which reflected the "general will" of all signatories--their common commitment to standards of public virtue that would govern the community. Each year the citizens would have to meet to reaffirm their commitment to this contract or to change it. On questions of basic law, Rousseau said, there could be no surrendering representation to secondary institutions.

Today, laws passed by local and national governments are presumed to provide the social contract for our communities. Obviously, this proposition is honored more in theory than in fact. Were our society to obey the law, there would be few murders, robberies, instances of vandalism, corporate rip-offs, and political corruption. Modern America faces all of these problems, however, despite an abundance of laws to deal with them.

The problem is particularly acute in low-income and minority communities, in view of the uneven application of different laws to different groups. When laws governing racial discrimination are loosely enforced, it is hardly surprising that minority young people develop cynical attitudes about the government that makes them. When middle and upper-class young people receive mild sentences for vandalism in the suburbs, while their low-income counterparts in the inner city are treated severely--or at least expected to be by the public--it is not surprising that urban young people end up viewing police, the courts, and the law itself as the enemy. Unfortunately, it is not judges who suffer the consequences of a disrespect for law, it is the neighborhoods themselves. For these communities, the results are catastrophic, as much for the vandals as for their victims.

Therefore, given that the laws of society have lost their force in many neighborhoods, perhaps it is time for the people of these neighborhoods to heed Rousseau's advice and develop social contracts of their own. Such a process would have seemed almost inevitable to early Americans. To them, in a country this large, law made sense only when enforced in a small community of a few citizens, assumed to be equal in influence and dignity--citizens who shared through continuing discussion a sense of what their community required. Under these conditions, social pressure would be as effective in enforcing common standards as the courts. Without this strong social support, moreover, early Americans realized that the laws would appear foreign and tyrannical, regardless of the process for choosing legislators. They knew, in short, that respect for law depends upon consent, and that consent often depends upon the opportunity to affirm, actively, whatever the precise agreement is to be.

C. Social Contract Technique

Designing a neighborhood social contract is like setting up a code of rules or law. Let's say, for example, that the leaders of a community want to establish a social contract for neighborhood security. Their normal response to neighborhood crime would be to call a meeting where residents would air their complaints. Then someone would outline a few techniques for self-protection--watching one another's homes, patrolling blocks, etc. Someone else would call for a follow-up meeting with the police. Then the leaders would pass around a sign-up sheet for volunteers to work on future programs and everyone would go home.

What sort of common purpose would this meeting develop, however? While a few people would sound off, the rest would remain quiet. Nor would anyone know what the other neighbors thought about the problem. Security affects everyone, not just the people who come to meetings. Without some visible commitment from the entire community to enforce standards of protection, no one would feel genuinely safe.

This is where the social contract technique could make a difference. Instead of asking, "What are your complaints?" the chairperson would start by asking, "What rules should we make governing security in this neighborhood?" The discussion, then, would aim at developing a list of acceptable community standards. It would not matter that some rules merely

repeated existing laws. The important point is that the neighbors themselves would agree to enforce the rules, or to demand their enforcement by existing authorities. Moreover, they would express this agreement not merely by voting for the contract, but by signing it. That is the point of a contract: people sign it. They also seek the signatures of everyone in the neighborhood. When they have canvassed their blocks for signatures, they recopy the contract with all the signatures and distribute it to everyone. From that point forward, people who complained about problems of security would refer not merely to laws, but to the specific rules that the community had endorsed. Then the neighborhood association could work to prevent continuing violations of the rules.

The advantages of social contracts should be obvious, but we will list a few of the most important ones.

First, contracts force neighbors to think about the positive values hidden behind their complaints. Listing only what's wrong with a community discourages people, unless they feel that they can do something to improve it. Thinking specifically about what the neighborhood ought to be gives people hope that improvement is possible.

Second, contracts show the majority of the neighbors that they do share certain standards for their neighborhood. Often, neighbors feel like they are the only ones who are concerned about a particular problem or issue. A social contract, signed by all the people around them, tells everyone that they are not alone--that they can turn to their neighbors for assistance. The process is critical to building community.

Third, contracts offer potential violators a gentle warning to change their ways before the neighbors single them out. Usually, residents know when they are doing something considered unacceptable. They may even feel that a particular rule is "aimed at them." Yet this is a healthy feeling. It shows that they are aware of their behavior. The contract, signed by their neighbors, tells them to shape up without pointing directly at them.

Fourth, contracts tell institutions external to the neighborhood what the standards of the community are. Police officers who know that neighbors have signed a security contract will have a clear understanding of how they feel about crime and harassment. Real estate agents and landlords ought to receive all social contracts covering issues like noise, pets, and curfews, so that they can make potential homebuyers and

tenants aware of them. Moreover, as we shall see, the contract technique is a good way to negotiate agreements between residents and institutions--banks, businesses, even public officials. If a community doesn't always have the power to pass a law, it might at least be able to force a specific private or public agency to endorse a contract. Signed agreements of this kind can help define what society means by phrases like "corporate" or "public responsibility."

Finally, contracts clarify the strength of the community itself. Obviously, a list of rules, even one signed by everyone, is no better than the willingness of the neighbors to enforce them. An agreement with an institution, likewise, will make sense only if both sides live up to it. Some community organizations show their strength by the number of victories they can win against the establishment. Others measure it by the number of programs they sponsor. The contract technique establishes the most compelling, but fairest, standard of all--the ability of an organization to reflect and enforce the best values of those whom it pretends to represent.

In many of these sessions, we will ask participants to imagine what model social contracts for their neighborhoods would look like. In a few cases, we will reproduce contracts already in use in different communities. We expect that a few community leaders will not wait for the end of the course to apply the technique; they will get started right away. In the first seminar conducted by the Institute using the technique, this is exactly what happened. There are now several blocks in Philadelphia using social contracts. Soon, we expect many more. It is a simple technique, but an important one. As this entire course argues, community emerges when people discover what they share. A social contract affirms this discovery in a language that everyone can understand.

D. Breakdown of Sessions

Session 1. Preconditions of Community

In this session, students will be asked to define what they mean by a "community," then whether they feel that their neighborhoods constitute active communities. They will be asked to familiarize themselves with the preconditions of community to be explored in the course--security, reciprocity, fellowship, and justice. To what extent do established institutions promote each of these values in neighborhoods? To what extent would an active community organization be required to promote these values?

Readings:

"Observations on Community," John Schaar
"The Uses of City Neighborhoods," from The Life and Death of American Cities, Jane Jacobs, in "The City as a Community," Edited by Gerald Lilenward, pp. 111-120.

Session 2. The Value of Security

This session will examine problems of security within the neighborhoods. Are there issues of security in the neighborhoods? What are they? How are police, school, social service, and community institutions responding to them? Do residents define security merely as freedom from crime, or do groups of young people on street corners constitute threats to security as well? What would a secure neighborhood look like?

Readings:

"Crime Patterns in Philadelphia: 1840-1870," by David R. Johnson, in The Peoples of Philadelphia, Allan Davis & Mark Haller, pp. 89-107.

Session 3. The Value of Reciprocity

Reciprocity is the value of fairness in dealings between citizens. A sense of reciprocity is critical to relationships within the neighborhoods. Do residents of a neighborhood make equivalent contributions to its well-being, or do some do "all the work," while others contribute nothing to the quality of life? Is there a balance between the claims of different groups within the neighborhood-residents, developers, industrial plants, stores--or do some groups get special treatment? What, then, are the issues of reciprocity within the neighborhood to which a community association might respond?

Readings:

"Industrial Metropolis as Inheritance," The Private City, Sam Bass Warner, Jr., pp. 202-210.

The Urban Neighborhood, excerpts, Suzanne Langer, pp. 1-36.

"How Americans Combat Individualism by the Principle of Self-Interest, Rightly Understood," Alexis de Tocqueville, Democracy in America, Volume II, Book II, Chapter 8.

Session 4. The Value of Fellowship

To what extent does the neighborhood promote friendships among residents? Around what institutions do friendship patterns develop? Or is the neighborhood merely a geographic center for isolated people? Are the blocks organized? Should a community association attempt to promote fellowship in the

neighborhood, or would most residents prefer to be left to themselves?

Readings:

"Spirit of Township in New England," Alexis de Tocqueville, Democracy in America, Volume I, Chapter 5.

"The Ghetto as a Cultural Community," (Jewish) from The Ghetto, Lewis Wirth, pp. 201-226.

"Portrait of a Changing Irish Neighborhood," from That Most Distressful Nation, Andrew M. Greeley, pp. 231-245.

"Bronzeville," from Black Metropolis, St. Clair Drake and Horace R. Cayton, Volume II, pp. 383-397.

Session 5. The Ideal of Justice

Two distinct ideas of justice survive in America, reflecting the complex influences on our national values and goals. The dominant idea evolves from our liberal heritage as a free society that guarantees equality of opportunity to achieve private advantages of wealth and security. Within this tradition, government is obliged to protect the property of each person, to guarantee equality of opportunity of all groups to the rewards that society offers and to insure equality in voting and democratic institutions.

A second, more idealistic tradition, stemming from our religious traditions, has had a profound impact on America as well. In this tradition, justice is achieved only when all people work together to bring out the best qualities of each one. In Plato's formulation, the just community is one in which there is a "right ordering" of the spiritual, military, and economic needs of the community; and in which each person is making precisely the best contribution that he or she is suited to make. Most successful movements for economic justice in America have been based on something approaching this conception of justice.

As de Tocqueville argued, few Americans will state baldly that they have a right to do as they please, regardless of what happens around them. Most debates within society, and by extension within neighborhoods, reflect conflicts between the liberal and the idealistic conceptions of justice. Unfortunately, the warriors in these battles often never reach the point of sorting out the issues of principle that divide them. Instead, they attack one another racially or ethnically, or move away.

This session will engage students in a discussion of their own conception of justice and how it affects their view of a number of important community problems.

Readings:

The Model of Christian Charity, by John Winthrop.

"Wealth, by Andrew Carnegie," in Democracy and The Gospel of Wealth, Lexington, Mass., D.C. Heath and Company, 1949.

Andrew Jackson's Veto of the Second National Bank, July 10, 1832.

Session 6. Justice and Security

What would be a just strategy for a neighborhood association to adopt in dealing with issues of security--a strategy that only emphasized separating vandals and criminals from the community; a strategy that emphasized protecting the neighborhood from crime; or a strategy that worked on rehabilitating ex-offenders as well? This debate will be related to the principles of justice examined in the previous session.

Readings:

"The Future of the Lower Class," from The Unheavenly City, Edward Banfield, pp. 236-256.

John Maher of Delancey St., Grover Sales, excerpts, pp. 53-55; 59-61; 62-67; 92-93; 95-97; 157-161.

Session 7. Justice and Reciprocity

What is a just strategy for establishing reciprocity in dealings among neighborhood residents? Would the community association win support for a code of ethics in the neighborhood? To what extent will businesses and banks take the quality of neighborhood life into consideration in their investment and development decisions in the neighborhood? How can government deal fairly with neighborhoods in its own planning and development decisions? This, too, will be related to standards of justice explored in Session 5.

Readings:

William Raspberry, "Making Johnny Learn," Washington Post, January 30, 1976.

Robert Creamer, "Organizing Money," Public Policy Reader, Derek Shearer and Lee Webb, eds., Washington, Institute for Policy Studies, 1975.

Bill Callahan, "Fair Taxation with Real Representation," published by Tax Equity for America Party, Philadelphia.

Session 8. Justice and Fellowship

What kind of organization is best suited to promote fellowship around the pursuit of justice in neighborhoods--a cooperative, self-development organization that pools neighborhood resources to solve problems; a direct action organization that aims at winning victories from political and economic institutions; or the ward structure within the political parties? This session will explore the strengths and weaknesses of each strategy, consistent with the discussion of community and justice undertaken throughout the seminar.

Readings:

Cooperative Community Development, excerpts, Edited by Joe Falk, pp. 47-65.

"Conflict Tactics," from Reveille for Radicals, Saul Alinsky, pp. 132-146.

"How to Become a Statesman,"; "To Hold Your District: Study Human Nature and Act Accordin'"; "On Municipal Ownership"; "Tammany's Patriotism"; and "The Strenuous Life of the District Leader," from Plunkitt of Tammany Hall, William L. Riordan.

The last selection is composed of a "Statement of Purpose" from the Coalition of Labor Union Women and a sample lesson from "Grievance Handling for Effectiveness" from the curriculum of Trade Union Women's Studies, N.Y. State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

Adopted at the Founding Conference
March 23-24, 1974

Of the 34 million women in the work force—little more than 4 million women are members of unions. It is imperative that within the framework of the union movement we take aggressive steps to more effectively address ourselves to the critical needs of 30 million unorganized sisters and to make our unions more responsive to the needs of all women, especially the needs of minority women who have traditionally been singled out for particularly blatant oppression.

Women unionists work in almost every industry, in almost every part of the country. Despite their geographical, industrial and occupational separations, union women share common concerns and goals.

Full equality of opportunities and rights in the labor force require the full attention of the labor movement...and especially, the full attention of women who are part of the labor movement.

The primary purpose of this new national coalition is to unify all union women in a viable organization to determine, first—our common problems and concerns and, second—to develop action programs within the framework of our unions to deal effectively with our objectives. Through unity of purpose, the Coalition of Labor Union Women will seek to accomplish these goals. We recognize that our struggle goes beyond the borders of this nation and seek to link up with our working sisters and brothers throughout the world through concrete action of international workers' solidarity.

ORGANIZING UNORGANIZED WOMEN

Since less than twelve percent of the women in today's labor force are enrolled in labor unions, it is obvious that most working women are suffering economically. Statistics clearly demonstrate that the union member enjoys higher wages, better fringe benefits and working conditions and greater job security than the unorganized worker. The Coalition of Labor Union Women seeks to promote unionism and to encourage unions to be more aggressive in their efforts to bring unorganized women under collective bargaining agreements, particularly in those areas where there are large numbers of unorganized and/or minority women. CLUW will seek to create a greater awareness of the benefits of union membership. Within our intra, inter, and emerging union structures, we will work to encourage nonunion women to join us in the trade union movement.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IN THE WORK PLACE

Employers continue to profit by dividing workers on sexual, racial and age lines. This encourages the segregation of job classifications and results in wages and benefit losses to women. The power of unions must increasingly be brought to bear, through the process of collective bargaining, to correct these inequities. The Coalition will seek to encourage women, through their unions, to recognize and take positive action against job discrimination in hiring, promotion, classification and other aspects of work. Women must learn what their rights are under the law. We must become more knowledgeable of the specifics of collective bargaining; and of the contract clauses and workplace practices which discriminate against us. We must be informed

about what is and can be done within the labor movement to correct these situations. We seek to educate and inspire our union brothers to help achieve affirmative action in the work place.

POLITICAL ACTION AND LEGISLATION

It is imperative that union women, through action programs of the Coalition become more active participants in the political and legislative processes of our unions. Movement for full employment and job opportunities and shorter work weeks without loss of pay, child care legislation, a liveable minimum wage for all workers, improved maternity and pension benefits, improved health and safety coverage, expanded educational opportunities, mass action for final ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA), guaranteed collective bargaining rights for all workers, the right to strike, and an extension of truly protective legislation for all workers, are only a few of the political action programs in which CLUW must participate. Whenever or wherever possible, CLUW urges union women to seek election to public office or selection for governmental appointive office at local, county, state and national levels.

PARTICIPATION OF WOMEN WITHIN THEIR UNIONS

The Coalition seeks to inspire and educate union women to insure and strengthen our participation, to encourage our leadership and our movement into policy-making roles within our own unions and within the union movement in all areas. The Coalition supports the formation of women's committees and women's caucuses within labor unions at all levels, wherever necessary. Additionally the Coalition will encourage democratic procedures in all unions.

Union labor donated

SESSION I - WHAT IS A GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE? HOW CAN YOU USE IT EFFECTIVELY?

The purpose of a grievance procedure is to provide a means for an employee, without jeopardizing her job, to express a complaint and obtain a fair and equitable solution to the problem.

Grievance handling under the negotiated grievance procedure of a union contract is the instrument which makes the provisions of the contract effective. Without alert stewards, the contract can become meaningless. Processing a grievance unforeseen in the contract can establish a new precedent and new policy resulting in a supplementary agreement to cover it. The spirit and intent of the contract are often as important as its exact words.

Definition of Grievance Procedure:

An organized method of correcting an injustice on the job. The injustice could be:

A. Violation of Contract Provisions

- inadequate pay
- speed up
- violation of seniority rights
- unjust disciplinary action
- abuse from foreman or supervisor

B. Management Action Tending To Harm Union

- separate pay or job categories based on sex
- testing requirements that are not job-related
- denial of transfer or promotion on basis of race or sex

C. Violation of Federal, State or Local Laws

SESSION I - continued

Importance of Enforcing the Contract

Enforcing the contract is everybody's business - the union member - the shop steward - the Grievance Committee - the union officers and the international representative.

Often a union member has a grievance but does not report it to her steward because she thinks that it is something she can take care of by talking with her foreman. If she fails to get an adjustment, not only will she be hurting herself, but every other worker in the shop. Although not every complaint is a grievance, it is a wise steward who encourages the worker to report it.

Many grievances involve only one worker in the denial of contract protection and might be thought not worth the effort or the expense of processing. Yet that one violation opens the door to abuses for all members of the union because, uncorrected, it allows management to think the contract is not important to the union.

Union's Responsibility:

It is not always necessary for an individual to file a grievance. Many contracts contain a provision which gives the union the right to file on the worker's behalf. This clause is especially useful for cases that involve timid grievants.

The union's responsibility for filing and processing a grievance can cause problems when the union has to assert the rights of one member over the interests of another. An example of this occurs when the union grieves to support a woman with higher seniority over another with less seniority who was given the job

SESSION I - continued

The union has no choice but to process the grievance since one of the most important clauses of the contract is the seniority provision. The following case shows what was done to enforce the seniority clause in one union.

Sara, an assembler of special parts was employed on the 3 p.m. to 11 p.m. shift. She inquired about filing a grievance when her foreman by-passed her and transferred two other persons to the day shift with less seniority than she had.

When Sara asked her foreman about it, she was given double talk: that she was the best qualified worker and was needed on the second shift to train new workers, and there was nothing she could do about it since she had no transfer rights.

The shop steward successfully proceeded with the grievance and Sara was transferred to the day shift in accordance with seniority provision in the contract. Further, when the steward analyzed the foreman's remark that Sara was needed on the second shift because she was required to teach new employees, the company was made to pay Sara for all the time she had spent teaching new employees. The union found that she was working in a higher classification and was entitled to the higher rate plus back pay.

Effectively Processing Grievances:

- corrects grieved conditions
- enforces the contract
- enforces labor laws